THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(AUTHORISED EDITION),

FOURTH SERIES.

SEVENTH SESSION OF THE TWENTY-SIXTH PARLIAMENT

OF THE

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

64 VICTORIÆ.

VOLUME LXXXVI.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE SIXTEENTH DAY OF JULY TO THE TWENTY-SEVENTH DAY OF JULY.

1900.

NINTH VOLUME OF SESSION.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED

UNDER CONTRACT WITH HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE,

BY

WYMAN AND SONS, LIMITED, FETTER LANE, LONDON.

Chronology of "The Parliamentary Debates."

THE PARLIAMENTARY HISTORY contains all that can be collected of the Legislative History of this country from the Conquest to the close of the XVIIIth Century (1803), 36 vols. The chief sources whence these Debates are derived are the Constitutional History, 24 vols.; Sir Simonds D'Ewes' Journal; Debates of the Commons in 1620 and 1621; Chandler and Timberland's Debates, 22 vols.; Grey's Debates of the Commons, from 1667 to 1694, 10 vols.; Almon's Debates, 24 vols.; Debrett's Debates, 63 vols.; The Hardwicke Papers; Debates in Parliament by Dr. Johnson, &c., &c.

THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES commence with the year 1803, and the contents are set forth in the following Chronological Table:—

HISTORY.

CONQUEST to 34 GEO. II.—1066 to 1760.

Vol. 1 to 15, 1 Will. I. to 34 Geo. II. 1066-1760

REIGN OF GEORGE III.—1760 to 1820.

Vol. 15 to 35, 1 Geo. III. to 40 Geo. III. 1760-1800

(First Parliament.)

Vol. 35 .....41 Geo. III.....1801
— 36 .....42 — 1802

(Second Parliament.)

Vol. 36 .....42 Geo. III. 1802-3

DEBATES.

First Series.

(Second Parliament—*continued.*)

Vol. 1 & 2...44 Geo. III.....1803-4
— 3 to 5...45 — 1805
— 6 & 7...46 — 1806

(Third Parliament.)

Vol. 8 & 9...47 Geo. III 1806-7

(Fourth Parliament.)

Vol. 9 to 11...48 Geo. III. 1807-8
— 12 — 14...49 — 1809
— 15 — 17...50 — 1810
— 18 — 20...51 — ... 1810-11
— 21 — 23...52 — 1812

(Fifth Parliament.)

Vol. 24 to 26...53 Geo. III. ... 1812-13
— 27 & 28...54 — ... 1813-14
— 29 to 31...55 — ... 1814-15
— 32 — 34...56 — 1816
— 35 & 36...57 — 1817
— 37 — 38...58 — 1818

(Sixth Parliament.)

Vol. 39 & 40...59 Geo. III. 1819
— 41 .....60 — ... 1819-20

Second Series.

REIGN OF GEORGE IV.—1820 to 1830.

(Seventh Parliament.)

Vol. 1 to 3... 1 Geo. IV. 1820
— 4 & 5... 2 — 1821
— 6 — 7... 3 — 1822
— 8 — 9... 4 — 1823
— 10 — 11... 5 — 1824
— 12 — 13... 6 — 1825-6
— 14 — 15... 7 — 1826

(Eighth Parliament.)

Vol. 16 ..... 7 Geo. IV. 1826
— 17 ..... 8 — 1827
— 18 & 19... 9 — 1828
— 20 — 21...10 — 1829
— 22 to 25...11 — 1830

Third Series.

REIGN OF WILLIAM IV.—1830 to 1837.

(Ninth Parliament.)

Vol. 1 to 3... 1 Will. IV.....1830-1

(Tenth Parliament.)

Vol. 4 to 8... 2 Will. IV. 1831
— 9 — 14... 3 — 1832

(Eleventh Parliament.)

Vol. 15 to 20... 4 Will. IV. 1833
— 21 — 25... 5 — 1834

(Twelfth Parliament.)

Vol. 26 to 30... 6 Will. IV. 1835
— 31 — 35... 7 — 1836
— 36 — 38... 8 — 1837

REIGN OF VICTORIA—1837 to

(THIRTEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	39 to 44...	1	VICTORIA	1838
—	45 — 50...	2	—	1839
—	51 — 55...	3	—	1840
—	56 — 58...	4	—	(a) 1841

(FOURTEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	59	4	VICTORIA	(b) 1841
—	60 to 65...	5	—	1842
—	66 — 71...	6	—	1843
—	72 — 76...	7	—	1844
—	77 — 82...	8	—	1845
—	83 — 88...	9	—	1846
—	89 — 94...10		—	(a) 1847

(FIFTEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	95 10		VICTORIA	(b) 1847
—	96 to 101...11		—	1848
—	102 —107...12		—	1849
—	108 —113...13		—	1850
—	114 —118...14		—	1851
—	119 —122...15		—	(a) 1852

(SIXTEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	123 15		VICTORIA	(b) 1852
—	124 to 129...16		—	1853
—	130 —135...17		—	1854
—	136 —139...18		—	1855
—	140 —143...19		—	1856
—	144 20		—	(a) 1857

(SEVENTEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	145 to 147...20		VICTORIA	(b) 1857
—	148 —151 ..21		—	1858
—	152 —153...22		—	(a) 1859

(EIGHTEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	154 to 155...22		VICTORIA	(b) 1859
—	156 —160...23		—	1860
—	161 —164...24		—	1861
—	165 —168...25		—	1862
—	169 —172...26		—	1863
—	173 —176...27		—	1864
—	177 —180...28		—	1865

(NINETEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	181 to 184...29		VICTORIA	1866
—	185 —189...30		—	1867
—	190 —193...31		—	... 1867-8

(TWENTIETH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	194 to 198...32		VICTORIA	... 1868-9
—	199 —203 33		—	1870

(TWENTIETH PARLIAMENT—*cont.*)

Vol.	204 to 208...34		VICTORIA	1871
—	209 —213...35		—	1872
—	214 —217...36		—	1873

(TWENTY-FIRST PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	218 to 221...37		VICTORIA	1874
—	222 —226...38		—	1875
—	227 —231...39		—	1876
—	232 —236...40		—	1877
—	237 —242...41		—	1878
—	243 —249...42		—	... 1878-9
—	250 & 251...43		—	(a) 1880

(TWENTY-SECOND PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	252 to 256...43		VICTORIA	(b) 1880
—	257 —265...44		—	1881
—	266 —273...45		—	(a) 1882
—	274 & 275...45		—	(b) 1882
—	276 to 283...46		—	1883
—	284 —292...47		—	1884
—	293 —301...48		—	... 1884-5

(TWENTY-THIRD PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	302 to 307...49		VICTORIA	(a) 1886

(TWENTY-FOURTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	308 & 309...49		VICTORIA	(b) 1886
—	310 to 321...50		—	1887
—	322 —332...51		—	1888
—	333 —340...52		—	1889
—	341 —348...53		—	1890
—	349 —356...54		—	... 1890-1

Fourth Series.

(TWENTY-FOURTH PARLIAMENT—*cont.*)

Vol.	1 to 6...55		VICTORIA	1892

(TWENTY-FIFTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	7 56		VICTORIA	1892
—	8 to 21...57		—	... 1893-4
—	22 — 29...57		—	1894
—	30 — 35...58		—	1895

(TWENTY-SIXTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	36 59		VICTORIA	1895
—	37 to 44...59		—	... 1895-6
—	45 — 52...60		—	1897
—	53 — 65...61		—	1898
—	66 — 76...62		—	1899
—	77 63		—	1899
—	78 63		—	1900
—	79 63		—	1900
—	80 63		—	1900
—	81 63		—	1900
—	82 63		—	1900
—	83 63		—	1900
—	84 ... 63 & 64		—	1900
—	85 64		—	1900
—	86 64		—	1900

HER MAJESTY'S PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF STATE, ETC.

THE CABINET.

Prime Minister and Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs——Most Hon. the Marquess of SALISBURY, K.G.
Lord President of the Council——His Grace the Duke of DEVONSHIRE, K.G.
Lord Chancellor——Rt. Hon. Earl of HALSBURY.
Lord Privy Seal——Rt. Hon. Viscount CROSS, G.C.B., G.C.S.I.
First Lord of the Treasury——Rt. Hon. ARTHUR J. BALFOUR.
Secretaries of State——
Home Department——Rt. Hon. Sir MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY, Bt.
Colonial——Rt. Hon. JOSEPH CHAMBERLAIN.
War——Most Hon. Marquess of LANSDOWNE, K.G., G.C.M.G., G.C.S.I.
India——Rt. Hon. Lord GEORGE HAMILTON.
Chancellor of the Exchequer——Rt. Hon. Sir MICHAEL HICKS BEACH, Bt.
First Lord of the Admiralty——Rt. Hon. GEORGE JOACHIM GOSCHEN.
Lord Lieutenant of Ireland——Rt. Hon. Earl CADOGAN, K.G.
Lord Chancellor of Ireland——Rt. Hon. Lord ASHBOURNE.
President of the Board of Trade——Rt. Hon. CHARLES THOMSON RITCHIE.
Secretary for Scotland——Rt. Hon. Lord BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH.
President of the Local Government Board——Rt. Hon. HENRY CHAPLIN.
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster——Rt. Hon. Lord JAMES OF HEREFORD.
First Commissioner of Works——Rt. Hon. A. AKERS DOUGLAS.
President of the Board of Agriculture——Rt. Hon. WALTER H. LONG.

NOT IN THE CABINET.

Postmaster-General——Marquess of LONDONDERRY, K.G.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury——Rt. Hon. Sir W. WALROND, M.P.
Financial Secretary to the Treasury——Rt. Hon. R. W. HANBURY, M.P.
Chief Secretary for Ireland——Rt. Hon. GERALD W. BALFOUR, M.P.
Vice-President of the Committee of Council——Rt. Hon. Sir J. ELDON GORST, M.P.
Secretary to the Admiralty——W. G. ELLISON MACARTNEY, Esq., M.P.
Lords of the Treasury——H. T. ANSTRUTHER, Esq., M.P.; WILLIAM HAYES FISHER, Esq., M.P.; Lord STANLEY, M.P.
Lords of the Admiralty——Admiral Sir F. W. RICHARDS, G.C.B.; Vice-Admiral Sir F. G. D. BEDFORD, K.C.B.; Rear-Admiral A. K. WILSON, V.C., C.B.; Capt. A. W. MOORE, C.B., C.M.G.; J. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary, Foreign Office——Rt. Hon. W. ST. JOHN BRODRICK, M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary, Home Office——Rt. Hon. JESSE COLLINGS, M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary, Colonial Office——Rt. Hon. Earl of SELBORNE.
Parliamentary Secretary, India Office——Rt. Hon. Earl of ONSLOW, G.C.M.G.
Parliamentary Secretary, War Office——GEORGE WYNDHAM, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade——Rt. Hon. Earl of DUDLEY.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Local Government Board——T. W. RUSSELL, Esq., M.P.
Financial Secretary, War Office——J. POWELL-WILLIAMS, Esq., M.P.
Attorney-General——Sir R. B. FINLAY, Q.C., M.P.
Solicitor-General——Rt. Hon. E. CARSON, Q.C., M.P.

OTHER OFFICERS OF STATE.

Judge Advocate-General——Rt. Hon. Sir F. H. JEUNE, K.C.B., President Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Courts.
Lord Chamberlain——Rt. Hon. Earl of HOPETOUN, G.C.M.G.
Vice-Chamberlain——Hon. AILWYN E. FELLOWES, M.P.
Lord Steward——Rt. Hon. Earl of PEMBROKE AND MONTGOMERY, G.C.V.O.
Master of the Horse——His Grace the Duke of PORTLAND, K.G., G.C.V.O.
Paymaster-General——His Grace the Duke of MARLBOROUGH.
Comptroller of the Household——Viscount VALENTIA, M.P.
Treasurer of the Household——Viscount CURZON, M.P.
Master of the Buckhounds——Rt. Hon. Earl of COVENTRY.
Captain Yeoman of the Guard——Rt. Hon. Earl WALDEGRAVE.
Lords-in-Waiting——General Rt. Hon. Viscount BRIDPORT, G.C.B. (permanent)
Rt. Hon. Earl of KINTORE, G.C.M.G.
Rt. Hon. Earl of DENBIGH.
Rt. Hon. Lord CHURCHILL.
Rt. Hon. Lord HARRIS, G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E.
Rt. Hon. Lord LAWRENCE.
Rt. Hon. Earl of CLARENDON.
Rt. Hon. Lord BAGOT.

SCOTLAND.

Chief Secretary——Rt. Hon. Lord BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH.
Lord Justice-General——Rt. Hon. J. B. BALFOUR.
Lord Advocate——Rt. Hon. A. G. MURRAY, Q.C., M.P.
Lord Justice Clerk——Rt. Hon. Lord KINSBURGH, C.B.
Lord Clerk Register——His Grace the Duke of MONTROSE, K.T.
Lord High Commissioner——Rt. Hon. Earl of LEVEN AND MELVILLE.
Solicitor-General——CHARLES SCOTT-DICKSON, Esq., Q.C.

IRELAND.

Lord Lieutenant——Rt. Hon. Earl CADOGAN, K.G.
Lord Chancellor——Lord ASHBOURNE.
Chief Secretary——Rt. Hon. GERALD W. BALFOUR, M.P.
Under Secretary——Rt. Hon. Sir DAVID HARREL, K.C.B.
Attorney-General——Rt. Hon. J. ATKINSON, M.P.
Solicitor-General——GEO. WRIGHT, Esq.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

Chairman of Committees——Rt. Hon. Earl of MORLEY.
Clerk of Parliaments——HENRY J. L. GRAHAM, Esq., C.B.
Deputy Clerk of Parliaments (Clerk Assistant)——Hon. E. P. THESIGER, C.B.
Reading-Clerk and Clerk of Outdoor Committees——
Counsel to the Chairman of Committees——ALBERT GRAY, Esq.
Chief Clerk and Clerk of Public Bills——H. C. MALKIN, Esq.
Senior Clerks——
Clerk of Private Bills, and Taxing Officer of Private Bill Costs——R. W. MONRO, Esq.
Peers' Printed Paper Office——A. HARRISON, Esq.
Principal Clerk, Judicial Department, and Taxing Officer of Judicial Costs——E. F. TAYLOR, Esq.
Clerk of the Journals——W. A. LEIGH, Esq.
Principal Clerk of Private Committees—J. F. SYMONS JEUNE, Esq.
Other Clerks——F. SKENE, Esq.; W. H. HAMILTON GORDON, Esq.; C. L. ANSTRUTHER, Esq. (Clerk attending the Table); Hon. A. MCDONNELL; A. H. ROBINSON, Esq.; H. P. ST. JOHN, Esq.; V. M. BIDDULPH, Esq.; Hon. E. A. STONOR; H. J. F. BADELEY, Esq.; C. HEADLAM, Esq.; J. B. HOTHAM, Esq.
Accountant——G. FULKES, Esq.
Copyist——Mr. T. A. COURT; Assistant Copyist——Mr. H. P. NORRIS.
Messengers——Messrs. W. WORFELL, A. A. WORFELL, C. E. CHIZLETT, A. N. STOLL, J. W. F. LOCKE, J. MCMILLAN, G. BENNETT.
Librarian——S. ARTHUR STRONG, Esq.
Assistant Librarian——A. H. M. BUTLER, Esq.
Messenger——Mr. W. H. G. STREVENS.
Examiners for Standing Orders——C. W. CAMPION, Esq.; J. F. SYMONS JEUNE, Esq.; Clerk ——J. W. G. BOND, Esq.
Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod——Gen. Sir Michael A. S. BIDDULPH, G.C.B.
Yeoman Usher——Captain T. D. BUTLER.
Serjeant-at-Arms——Major-General Sir ARTHUR ELLIS, K.C.V.O., C.S.I.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS.—(*Cont.*)

Deputy Serjeant-at-Arms——S. Hand, Esq.
Resident Superintendent——Mr. J. K. Williams.
Shorthand Writer——W. H. Gurney Salter, Esq.
Principal Doorkeepers——Messrs. W. Chandler, E. Fox, F. Holman.
First Class Assistants——Messrs. C. Walker, J. Hedley, J. Lane.
Second Class Assistants——Messrs. B. Gallop, H. B. Strevens, G. W. Cross, W. Stopp.
Third Class Assistants——Messrs. J. Woolacott, A. A. Edney, J. F. Baum.
Messengers——Messrs. A. J. Solman, J. B. Forsyth, C. Chapman, W. Phillips, W. W. Meates.
Superintendent of Refreshment Rooms——Mr. William Aggas.
Inspector of Police attending the House of Lords——Mr. T. Kendrick.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Clerk of the House of Commons——Archibald Milman, Esq., C.B.
Clerk-Assistant——Francis B. G. Jenkinson, Esq., C.B.
Second Clerk-Assistant——Arthur W. Nicholson, Esq.
Principal Clerks——
Public Bill Office, and Clerk of Fees——W. Gibbons, Esq.
Clerk of the Journals——W. H. Ley, Esq.
Committee Office——R. Dickinson, Esq.
Private Bill Office——J. H. W. Somerset, Esq.
Senior Clerks——F. St. George Tupper, Esq.; H. C. Tower, Esq.; C. V. Frere, Esq.; L. T. Le Marchant, Esq.; G. C. Giffard, Esq.; Sir E. H. Doyle, Bart.
Assistant Clerks——S. L. Simeon, Esq.; Arthur I. Dasent, Esq.; E. C. Howe Browne, Esq.; Horace West, Esq.; Henry A. Ferguson-Davie, Esq.; Arthur H. Ellis, Esq.; Percy A. Bull, Esq.; F. R. Williams Wynn, Esq.; W. E. Grey, Esq.; F. C. Holland, Esq.; J. W. G. Bond, Esq.; T. L. Webster, Esq.
Junior Clerks——H. C. Dawkins, Esq.; A. F. B. Williams, Esq.; R. P. Colomb, Esq.; B. H. Fell, Esq.; R. E. Childers, Esq.; J. Scott Porter, Esq.; F. C. Bramwell, Esq.; R. A. Austen Leigh, Esq.; W. T. Legge, Esq.; C. R. Turner, Esq.; W. K. Gibbons, Esq.; A. E. A. W. Smyth, Esq.
Collectors of Fees on Private Bills——C. L. Lockton, Esq.
Shorthand Writer——W. H. Gurney Salter, Esq.
Office Clerk in Committee Office——Mr. T. Feilden Mitchell.
Office Clerk in Journal Office——Mr. A. A. Taylor.
Messengers——Messrs. J. J. Shelvey, C. Davie, W. Quantrill, H. Jones, G. D. Weller, J. Armstrong, J. Woodward, J. Ivory, G. Norman.
Serjeant-at-Arms——H. D. Erskine, Esq.
Deputy Serjeant——F. R. Gosset, Esq.
Assistant Serjeant——Lieut.-Col. Hon. E. H. Legge.
Doorkeepers——Mr. W. Wilson, Mr. M. Inglefield.
Office Messenger——Mr. C. J. H. Shearn.
Messengers (1st Class)——Mr. H. Hambling, Mr. C. Woodcraft, Mr. R. Robertson, Mr. J. Hills, Mr. J. Sprague, Mr. A. Andrews, Mr. T. B. Spray, Mr. G. Tye, Mr. R. Hobby, Mr. G. Anstey, Mr. J. H. Day.
Messengers (2nd Class)——Messrs. J. Henderson, G. Wainwright, J. Guyatt, R. Turtle, A. Haskell, A. C. Johnson, G. Clapperton, H. E. Linington.
Superintendent of Members' Waiting Room——Mr. J. F. Henley; Assistant——Mr. W. Broadbent; Porters——Messrs J. Oram, T. Martin.
Postmaster——Mr. Edmund W. Pike; Hall Keeper——Mr. J. Glynn.
Office Keeper——Mr. W. Harvey.
Chaplain to the House——Rev. Canon Basil Wilberforce, D.D.
Secretary to the Speaker——Edward Gully, Esq.
Counsel to the Speaker——Hon. E. Chandos Leigh, Q.C., C.B.
Trainbearer——Mr. J. French.
Messenger——Mr. G. T. Viney.
Referee of Private Bills——Alfred Bonham Carter, Esq., C.B.
Examiners of Private Bills——C. W. Campion, Esq., J. F. Symons Jeune, Esq.
Taxing Master——C. W. Campion, Esq.; Clerk——J. W. G. Bond, Esq.
Librarian——R. C. Walpole, Esq.; Assistant Librarian——E. G. Harvey, Esq.; Clerks in Library——Messrs. J. R. Crimp, Wm. Stewart; Messengers——Messrs. A. Firmin, W. Hague.
Vote Office——
Chief Clerk——H. A. M. Killick, Esq.
Assistant Clerks——P. E. Smith, Esq., H. Otway Mayne, Esq.
Messenger——Mr. John Edwards.
Printers——
Journals——G. E. Briscoe Eyre, Esq.
Votes——J. B. Nichols, Esq.
Chief Inspector of Police attending the House of Commons——Mr. Horsley.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TO

VOLUME LXXXVI.

NINTH VOLUME OF SESSION 1900.

LORDS: MONDAY, 16TH JULY, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Page

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 12); Local Government Provisional Orders (No 14); Coventry Corporation; Shannon Water and Electric Power; Hastings Corporation; Alexandra Park; Great Indian Peninsular Railway Company; Southport Corporation. The same were ordered to lie on the Table 1

Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 1

South Metropolitan Gas Bill—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 2

Portland Urban District Gas Bill; Sunderland Corporation Bill [H.L.]—Reported with Amendments 2

Tottenham Urban District Council Bill—Moved, That the Order made on the 12th day of March last, "That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after Tuesday, the 26th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2^a; agreed to; Bill read 2^a accordingly, and committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection... 2

Fraser Settled Chattels Bill [H.L.]—Read 3^a, and passed, and sent to the Commons... 2

Jarrow and Hebburn Electricity Supply Bill; Hastings Tramways Bill—Read 3^a, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 2

Belfast and County Down Railway Bill—Read 3^a, with the Amendment, and passed, and returned to the Commons 3

July 16.] *Page*

Durham (County of) Electric Power Supply Bill; Lancashire Electric Power Bill—Brought from the Commons; read 1ª, and referred to the Examiners 3

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill [H.L.]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill [H.L.]—Returned from the Commons agreed to 3

Great Eastern Railway Bill; London and St. Katherine Docks and East and West India Dock Companies Bill; St. Albans Water Bill—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 3

Donegal Railway Bill [H.L.]; Great Southern and Western Railway Bill [H.L.]—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments: The said Amendments considered, and agreed to 3

South Staffordshire Tramways Bill [H.L.]—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments 3

Gas Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill [H.L.]—Returned from the Commons with the Amendment agreed to 3

East London Water Bill; Rochdale Corporation Bill; East Ham Corporation Bill; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill; Plymouth, Stonehouse and Devonport Tramways Bill; Croydon Tramways and improvements Bill; London County Tramways (No. 1) Bill; London County Tramways (No. 2) Bill; Kingscourt, Keady and Armagh Railway Bill; Newry, Keady, and Tynan Light Railway Bill; Great Northern Railway Bill—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the following Lords be proposed to the House to form the Select Committee for the consideration of the said Bills, viz.:—M. Bath, E. Camperdown (Chairman), L. de Ramsey, L. Monkbretton, L. Stanmore; agreed to; and the said Lords appointed accordingly. The Committee to meet on Wednesday next, at Eleven o'clock; and all petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Bills to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Bills 3

Perth and Paisley Gas Provisional Orders Bill—Moved, That the Order made on the 12th day of March last, "That no Provisional Order Confirmation Bill brought before the House of Commons shall be read a second time after Tuesday the 26th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read a second time; agreed to. Bill read 2ª accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the whole House 4

Tramways Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill—Moved, That the Order of the 12th of March last, "That no Provisional Order Confirmation Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after Tuesday the 26th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read a second time; agreed to; Bill read 2ª accordingly, and committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 4

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill—House in Committee (according to Order). Amendments made; Standing Committee negatived; the Report of Amendments to be received To-morrow 4

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill—House in Committee (according to Order). Bill reported without amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow 4

July 16.] *Page*

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill—Amendments reported (according to Order), and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow 5

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) Bill; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill—House in Committee (according to Order). Bills reported without Amendment; Standing Committee negatived; and Bills to be read 3ª To-morrow 5

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill—House in Committee (according to Order). Amendments made; Standing Committee negatived; the Report of Amendments to be received To-morrow 5

London (St. Marylebone) Provisional Order Bill—Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners. (No. 188.) 5

Local Government Provisional Orders Bill—Suspension of Standing Orders; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 13) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 14) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 15) Bill; Local Government Provisional Order (Housing of Working Classes) Bill—Moved, "That the Order of the 12th of March last, 'That no Provisional Order Confirmation Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after Tuesday the 26th day of June next,' be dispensed with, and that the Bills be now read a second time."—(*Lord Harris*) 5

The Chairman of Committees (*The Earl of Morley*) 6

On Question agreed to; Bills read 2ª accordingly.

The Earl of Denbigh 6

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill; Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill; Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (Housing of Working Classes) Bill; Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (Housing of Working Classes) (No. 2) Bill—Moved, "That the Order of the 12th of March last, 'That no Provisional Order Confirmation Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after Tuesday the 26th day of June next,' be dispensed with, and that the Bills be now read a second time."—(*The Earl of Denbigh.*)

The Earl of Morley 6

On Question, agreed to. Bills read 2ª accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Thursday next.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill—Committed. The Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection... 7

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 13) Bill—Committed to a Committee of the whole House To-morrow 7

July 16.] *Page*

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 15) Bill—Committed to a Committee of the whole House 7

Local Government Provisional Order (Housing of the Working Classes) Bill—Committed to a Committee of the whole House To-morrow 7

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

NAVY (COURTS-MARTIAL)—Returns of the number of Courts-martial held and summary punishments inflicted on seamen of the Royal Navy, etc., during the year 1899 7

SOUTH AFRICA—Further correspondence relating to affairs in South Africa (in continuation of [Cd. 43], January 1900) 7

RAILWAY RETURNS—Return as to the capital, traffic, receipts, and working expenditure, etc., of the railway companies of the United Kingdom, for the year 1899 7

INDIA (ACCOUNTS AND ESTIMATES, 1900–1901)—Explanatory memorandum by the Secretary of State for India 8

MINT—Thirtieth Annual Report of the Deputy Master and Comptroller of the Mint, for 1900. Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 8

PUBLIC WORKS LOAN BOARD—Twenty-fifth Annual Report, 1898–99; with appendices 8

SUPERANNUATION—Treasury Minute, dated 6th July, 1900, granting a retired allowance to Mr. T. G. Pinches, first class assistant at the British Museum, under Section 2 of the Superannuation Act, 1887 8

MERCHANT SEAMEN'S FUND—Account of the receipt and expenditure under the Seamen's Fund Winding-up Act, from 1st January to 31st December, 1899 8

TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION ACT, 1889—Minute of the Board of Education sanctioning the subjects to be taught under Clause 8 of the Technical Instruction Act, 1889, for the county borough of Oldham, seventh minute 8

POLLING DISTRICTS (YORKSHIRE, WEST RIDING)—Order made by the County Council of the West Riding of Yorkshire constituting polling districts and polling places in the Parliamentary Divisions of Shipley, Sowerby, and Colne Valley. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 8

QUEEN ANNE'S BOUNTY BOARD—Report from the Joint Committee (with the proceedings of the Committee) made, and to be printed. (No. 186)... 8

HOME DEFENCE—MILITARY RESOURCES.

The Earl of Wemyss 8

INDIAN FAMINE—PRESENT OUTLOOK—Question, Lord Sandhurst; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (The Earl of Onslow) 9

July 16.]

Page

RITUALISM IN THE CHURCH.

DISCUSSION:—

The Earl of Portsmouth ... 10
The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury 18
The Earl of Cranbrook ... 24
The Prime Minister and Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (The Marquess of Salisbury) ... 25
Viscount Halifax 28
The Lord Bishop of Winchester ... 35

Members of Local Authorities Relief Bill [H.L.]—House in Committee (according to Order).

The Duke of Northumberland 36

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2:—

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 2, page 1, line 9, to leave out 'private,' and in line 10, to leave out 'private.'"—(*The Marquess of Lansdowne.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Other Amendments agreed to.

Clause 3 amended and agreed to.

Bill recommitted to the Standing Committee; and to be printed as amended. (No. 187).

Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension Bill — [THIRD READING]—Order of the Day for the Third Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read the third time."—(*Viscount Cross.*)

The Earl of Wemyss ... 37 *Viscount Cross* 39

On Question, agreed to.

Bill read 3ª accordingly, with the Amendment, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

County Courts (Ireland) Bill [H.L.]—House in Committee (according to Order).

The Earl of Dartrey ... 39
The Lord Chancellor of Ireland (Lord Ashbourne) ... 39
The Earl of Mayo 40

Clauses agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and recommitted to the Standing Committee.

Veterinary Surgeons (Amendment) Bill—House in Committee (according to Order); Bill reported without amendment; and recommitted to the Standing Committee 40

House adjourned at Seven of the clock.

July 16.] *Page*

COMMONS: MONDAY, 16TH JULY, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Durham (County of) Electric Power Supply Bill [BY ORDER]—As amended, considered.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time."—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

DISCUSSION:—

Mr. Galloway (*Manchester, S.W.*) 40
Mr. Evelyn Cecil (*Hertfordshire, Hertford*) 41

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed.

South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Bill [BY ORDER]—As amended, considered.

Mr. Maclean (*Cardiff*) 41

Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill [Lords]—Order read for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [10th July], "That the Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill [Lords] be committed to a Select Committee."—(*Lord Hugh Cecil.*)

Question again proposed—Debate resumed.

DISCUSSION:—

Lord Hugh Cecil (*Greenwich*) 42
Mr. Flower (*Bradford, W.*) 44
The Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education (*Sir J. Gorst, Cambridge University*) 46

Motion, by leave, withdrawn

Bill committed.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That it be an Instruction to the Committee on the Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill [Lords] to leave out Plan No. 41 in the Schedule."—(*Mr. Causton.*)

DISCUSSION:—

Lord Hugh Cecil 50
Mr. Flower 51
Sir J. Gorst 52
Mr. Causton (*Southwark, W.*) ... 52

Question put, and negatived.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH)—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz.:—Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [Lords]. Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time To-morrow 52

July 16.] *Page*

Hamilton, Motherwell, and Wishaw Tramways Bill—Lords Amendments considered and agreed to, with an Amendment 53

Lee Conservancy Bill; North Metropolitan Railway and Canal Bill—Lords Amendments considered and agreed to 53

Falkirk and District Water Bill [Lords]—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 53

Westgate and Birchington Water Bill [Lords]—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment 53

Dearne Valley Railway Bill [Lords]—Not amended, considered; to be read the third time 53

Glyncorrwg Urban District Council Gas Bill [Lords]; London Sea Water Supply Bill [Lords]—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 53

Whitechapel and Bow Railway Bill [Lords]—As amended, considered; an amendment made; Bill to be read the third time 53

Lancashire Electric Power Bill [by Order]—As amended, considered. Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read thet hird time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*) Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed 53

Caledonian Railway Bill [Lords]; Morley Corporation Bill [Lords]; South Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railways Bill [Lords]—Read a second time, and committed 53

North Metropolitan Electric Power Supply Bill [By Order]—Ordered, That in the case of the North Metropolitan Electric Power Supply Bill Standing Orders 84, 214, and 239 be suspended, and that the Bill be now taken into consideration, provided amended prints shall have been previously deposited.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*) Bill, as amended, considered accordingly; to be read the third time 53

Gas Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill—Lords Amendment considered and agreed to 54

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [Lords]—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 54

Water Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords]—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment 54

Edinburgh (Housing of the Working Classes) Improvement Scheme Provisional Order Bill; Paisley Waterworks Provisional Order Bill—Read a second time, and committed 54

Standing Orders—Resolutions reported from the Committee:—1. "That in the case of the Workington Railways and Docks Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with, on condition that the powers contained in Clause 131 to the London and North-Western Railway Company be struck out of the Bill, and that the powers to the Cleator and Workington Junction Railway Company be also struck out of the Bill, unless it be proved before the Committee to whom the Bill is referred that the Bill has been submitted to and approved by the last-named Company:—That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."

July 16.] *Page*

2. "That, in the case of the Crystal Palace Company Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with:—That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill."

3. "That, in the case of the Military Manœuvres Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought not to be dispensed with."

First two Resolutions agreed to.

Report to lie upon the Table 54

Crystal Palace Company Bill [Lords]—Report [this day] from the Select Committee on Standing Orders read.
Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.—(*Mr. Caldwell*) 55

Workington Railways and Docks Bill [Lords]—Report [this day] from the Select Committee on Standing Orders read.
Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.—(*Mr. Caldwell*) 55

Motherwell and Bellshill Railway Bill [Lords]—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the table, and to be printed 55

Rotherhithe and Ratcliff Tunnel Bill [Lords]—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 55

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS—That they have agreed to Amendments to—Edinburgh District Lunacy Board Bill [Lords], Falkirk Corporation Bill [Lords], Rhymney Railway Bill [Lords], Cork Electric Tramways Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

That they have passed the Bill intituled, "An Act to authorise the sale of the chattels bequeathed and settled by the will and codicils of the late Sir William Augustus Fraser, Bart., deceased, and to declare the trusts of the proceeds of such sale; and for other purposes." Fraser Settled Chattels Bill [Lords] 55

Fraser Settled Chattels Bill [Lords]—Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills 55

PETITIONS.

Military Manœuvres Bill—Petition of Belfast City and District Water Commissioners against dispensing with the Standing Orders; Referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders 55

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday Bill—Petition from Langley Moor, in favour; to lie upon the Table 55

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children (No. 2) Bill—Petitions in favour, from Twickenham (two); and Langley Moor; to lie upon the Table 56

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children (Scotland) Bill—Petitions in favour, from Kelton; and Stornoway; to lie upon the Table 56

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

MINT—Copy presented, of Thirtieth Annual Report of the Deputy Master of the Mint, 1899 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 56

July 16.] *Page*

PUBLIC WORKS LOAN BOARD—Copy presented, of Twenty-fifth Annual Report (for 1899–1900), with Appendices [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 274.] 56

SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1887—Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 6th July, 1900, granting to Mr. T. G. Pinches, First Class Assistant at the British Museum, a Retired Allowance under the Act [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 56

EAST INDIA (ACCOUNTS AND ESTIMATES, 1900–1901)—Copy presented, of Explanatory Memorandum by the Secretary of State for India [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 56

SOUTH AFRICA—Copy presented, of Further Correspondence relating to Affairs in South Africa [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 56

POLLING DISTRICTS (WEST RIDING OF YORKSHIRE)—Copy presented, of Order made by the County Council of the West Riding of Yorkshire constituting Polling Districts and Polling Places in the Parliamentary Divisions of Shipley, Sowerby, and Colne Valley [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 56

TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION ACT, 1889—Copy presented, of Minute sanctioning the Subjects to be taught under Clause 8 of the Act, for the County Borough of Oldham (Seventh Minute), dated 2nd July, 1900 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 56

RAILWAY RETURNS—Copy Presented, of Return as to the Capital, Traffic Receipts, and Working Expenditure, &c., of the Railway Companies of the United Kingdom for the year 1899 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 57

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 4) Bill—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 13th July; *Mr. Ritchie*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 275.] 57

MERCHANT SEAMEN'S FUND—Account presented, of the Receipts and Expenditure under the Seamen's Fund Winding-up Act from 1st January to 31st December, 1899 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 276.] 57

NAVY (COURTS MARTIAL)—Copy presented, of Return of the number of Courts Martial held and Summary Punishments inflicted during the year 1899 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 57

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT, 1897 (ARMY AND NAVY SERVICE) (MEN EMPLOYED)—Return presented, relative thereto [Address 14th June; *Mr. Woods*]; to lie upon the Table 57

MEDICAL AND SANITARY ARRANGEMENTS AT THE CAPE—Return presented relative thereto [Address 10th July; *Sir James Kitson*]; to lie upon the Table 57

QUESTIONS.

CHINA—ANTI-FOREIGN OUTBREAK—RECENT NEWS—REPORTED GENERAL MASSACRE OF EUROPEANS IN PEKING—POSITION AT TIENTSIN AND TA-KU—Question, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs); Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) 57

July 16.] *Page*

MEASURES TAKEN FOR SAFETY OF PEKING LEGATIONS—Question, Mr. Maclean (Cardiff); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 59

COMMUNICATIONS WITH THE CHINESE GOVERNMENT—Question, Mr. Dillon (Mayo E.); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 60

COMMAND OF THE ALLIED FORCES—Question, Mr. Dillon; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 61

CHINA PAPERS—Question, Mr. Dillon; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 61

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL ARRANGEMENTS—COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY—Questions, Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.), and Sir Walter Foster (Derbyshire, Ilkestone); Answers, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 61

DESPATCHES—Questions, Capt. Sinclair (Forfarshire), and Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 62

TRANSPORT RETURN—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Macartney, Antrim, S.) 62

MINISTERIAL CRISIS IN CAPE COLONY—Question, Capt. Sinclair; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. J. Chamberlain, Birmingham, W.) 63

MARTIAL LAW—ARREST OF MR. JACOBUS BOTHA—Question, Sir Wilfrid Lawson (Cumberland, Cockermouth); Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain ... 63

MARTIAL LAW IN CAPE COLONY—Question, Mr. Buchanan (Aberdeenshire, E.); Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain 64

COURT MARTIAL PUNISHMENTS — Question, Mr. Humphreys-Owen (Montgomeryshire); Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain 64

CIVIL SURGEONS AT THE FRONT—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for War (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 64

FEVER AT LADYSMITH—Question, Sir Walter Foster; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 64

TREATMENT OF DISCHARGED SOLDIERS—CASE OF ROBERT WEIR—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 65

CASUALTY RETURNS—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer Mr. Wyndham 66

IRISH MILITIAMEN AND THE HARVEST — Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien (Kilkenny); Answer Mr. Wyndham 66

CHELSEA HOSPITAL GARDEN—Question, Mr. Massey-Mainwaring (Finsbury, Central); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 67

ARMY LANCES—SERJEANT CARTWRIGHT'S CLAIM—Question, Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the War Office (Mr. J. Powell-Williams, Birmingham, S.) 67

NAVAL CONSTRUCTION—INFLAMMABLE WOODWORK—Question, Mr. Provand (Glasgow, Blackfriars); Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Goschen, St. George's, Hannover Square) 68

AUSTRALIAN COMMONWEALTH — FIRST GOVERNOR-GENERAL — OFFICIAL RESIDENCE—Question, Mr. Hogan (Tipperary, Mid); Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain 69

July 16.] *Page*

INDIAN AND AUSTRALIAN MAILS — Question, Mr. Hogan; Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Hanbury, Preston) 69

ASHANTI—NATIVE RISING — INVESTMENT OF COOMASSIE — Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain 70

INDIAN FAMINE — ADVANCES TO LAND CULTIVATORS — Question, Mr. Buchanan; Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Lord George Hamilton, Middlesex, Ealing) 71

ST. PETERSBURG HERRING TRADE — Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 71

TEACHERS' SUPERANNUATION IN THE CHANNEL ISLANDS AND THE ISLE OF MAN —Question, Mr. Yoxall (Nottingham, W.); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir M. White Ridley, Lancashire, Blackpool) 71

VACCINATION PROSECUTIONS—CASE OF F. J. CHATTING.—Question, Mr. Louis Sinclair (Essex, Romford); Answer, Sir M. White Ridley 72

LONDON SCHOOL BOARD—RE-HOUSING SCHEMES.—Question, Mr. Pickersgill (Bethnal Green, S.W.); Answer, Sir M. White Ridley 73

DORKING RURAL DISTRICT COUNCIL.—Question, Mr. Cubitt (Surrey, Reigate); Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Chaplin, Lincs., Sleaford) 73

DEVIZES PRISON—WARDER HARGRAVE'S PENSION.—Question, Mr. Goulding (Wilts, Devizes); Answer, Mr. Hanbury 74

RAILWAY PASSENGERS' FREE LUGGAGE.—Questions, Sir Cameron Gull (Devonshire, Barnstaple) and Mr. Trevelyan (Yorkshire West Riding, Elland); Answers, Mr. Hanbury 74

PILLAR BOXES IN THE METROPOLIS—Question, Mr. Cohen (Islington, E.); Answer, Mr. Hanbury 75

PALACE OF WESTMINSTER—WORKS DEPARTMENT—EMPLOYEES' GRIEVANCES. —Question, Mr. Labouchere (Northampton); Answer, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Akers-Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) 76

FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE REGULATIONS IN NORFOLK. — Question, Mr. Soames (Norfolk, S.); Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas 77

SANITATION IN THE ISLAND OF LEWIS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. A. Graham-Murray, Buteshire) 77

SCOTTISH FISHERIES—AVOCH (ROSS-SHIRE) HARBOUR.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. A. Graham-Murray 78

DEPORTATION OF PAUPERS TO IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien; Answer, The Secretary to the Local Government Board (Mr. T. W. Russell, Tyrone, S.) 78

GREYSTONES (CO. WICKLOW) FORESHORE.—Questions, Mr. James O'Connor (Wicklow, W.) and Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N.); Answers, Mr. Hanbury ... 79

LISTOWEL-BALLYBUNION RAILWAY.—Question, Mr. Flavin; Answer, Mr. Hanbury 80

July 16.] *Page*

GREEVEGUILLA (CO. KERRY) MAILS.—Question, Mr. Flavin; Answer, Mr. Hanbury 80

IRISH CATTLE SENT TO THE PORT OF LONDON.—Question, Mr. James O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas 81

MONAGHAN PETTY SESSIONAL APPEALS—CASES OF M'GUIGAN AND HUGHES.—Question, Mr. Macaleese (Monaghan, N.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. G. W. Balfour, Leeds, Central) 81

BELFAST LAND COMMISSION—INCREASE OF RENT.—Question, Mr. Samuel Young (Cavan, E.); Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour 82

IRISH LOCAL GOVERNMENT — RATE ADJUSTMENTS. — Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour 82

IRISH LOAN FUND BOARD.—Question, Mr. Dillon; Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour 82

BELFAST RATES.—Question, Mr. Macaleese; Answer, The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.) 84

GLEBE LOANS ACTS.—Question Mr. M'Ghee (Louth, S.); Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour... 84

INSPECTOR-GENERAL, ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY.—Questions, Mr. Flavin and Mr. Dillon; Answers, Mr. G. W. Balfour 85

CASE OF EDMUND CARMONY—Question, Mr. Flavin; Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour... 85

IRISH COUNTY COURT ADMINISTRATION — Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 86

SUNDAY OPENING OF PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS.—Questions, Mr. Massey-Mainwaring; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 86

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE — Questions, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Courtney (Cornwall, Bodmin), Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis), Mr. Arnold-Forster (Belfast, W.), Mr. Channing (Northamptonshire, E.), Mr. Maclean and Mr. Flavin; Answers and Statement, Mr. A. J. Balfour ... 87

PUBLIC BUSINESS.

QUEEN ANNE'S BOUNTY BOARD (JOINT COMMITTEE) — Report, with Minutes of Evidence, from the Joint Committee, brought up, and read; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 277.]... 92

FIRE BRIGADES—Report from the Select Committee, brought up, and read; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 278.]
Minutes of the Proceedings of the Committee to be printed. [No. 278.] 92

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS—That they have agreed to—Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension Bill, with an Amendment. That they have agreed to—Railways (Prevention of Accidents) Bill, with Amendments 92

Railways (Prevention of Accidents) Bill — Lords Amendments to be considered upon Thursday, and to be printed. [Bill 299.] 93

July 16.] *Page*

THE IRISH LANGUAGE IN IRISH SCHOOLS—Proposed motion for adjournment.
Mr. John Redmond 93

Leave for adjournment refused.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (SUPPLY)—Ordered, That three additional days be allowed to the Business of Supply—(*Mr A. J. Balfour.*)

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE, GOVERNMENT BUSINESS—Motion made and Question proposed, "That, for the remainder of the session, Government Business be not interrupted under the provisions of any Standing Order regulating the Sittings of the House; and may be entered upon at any hour, though opposed, and that at the conclusion of Government Business each day Mr. Speaker do adjourn the House without Question put.—*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

DISCUSSION :—

Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs) ... 95
Mr. Leighton (Shropshire, Oswestry) 98
Mr. Pickersgill (Bethnal Green, S.W.) 98
Mr. Dillon (Mayo, E.) ... 99
Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis) 102
Mr. Lawson Walton (Leeds, S.) 193
Mr. Channing (Northamptonshire, E.) 103
Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley) 105
Mr. Lloyd-George (Carnarvon Boroughs) 105
Mr. Galloway (Manchester, S.W.) 107
Mr. Labouchere (Northampton) ... 108
Col. Milward (Warwickshire, Stratford-on-Avon) 109
Mr. Buchanan (Aberdeenshire, E.) 110
The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 110

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 240 ; Noes, 114. (Division List No. 219.) Ordered, That for the remainder of the Session, Government Business be not interrupted under the provisions of any Standing Order regulating the Sittings of the House ; and may be entered upon at any hour, though opposed, and that at the conclusion of Government Business each day Mr. Speaker do adjourn the House without Question put.

Tithe Rent-Charge (Ireland) Bill—Order for Third Reading read, and discharged.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the Bill be re-committed in respect of the New Clause (Exclusion of certain annuities and rent charges), and the Amendment to the Scedule."—(*Mr. G. W. Balfour.*)

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the words from the word 're-committed,' to the end of the question."—(*Mr. Swift MacNeill.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.) 119
Mr. T. P. O'Connor (Liverpool, Scotland) 120
Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.E.) ... 122
Mr. Carvell Williams (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield... 123
Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis) 124
Serjeant Hemphill (Tyrone, N.) 125
Mr. Herbert Lewis (Flint Boroughs) 126
Mr. Dillon (Mayo, E.) 127
The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 130

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 116; Noes, 81. (Division List No. 220.)

Main question put, and agreed to.

Bill re-committed in respect of the New Clause (Exclusion of certain annuities and rent-charges), and the Amendment to the Schedule.

Bill considered in Committee.

[Mr. J. W. Lowther, Cumberland, Penrith, in the Chair.]

A Clause—

"(1) Section one of this Act shall not apply to any actual sum charged upon land the fee simple of which has after the creation of such charge and before the thirteenth day of April one thousand eight hundred and ninety-six been conveyed to a purchaser on a sale.

"(2) Sections three and four of this Act shall not apply to any tithe rent-charge payable to the Land Commission out of hereditaments the fee simple of which has after the tenth day of August one thousand eight hundred and seventy-two and before the twelfth day of May one thousand eight hundred and ninety-nine been conveyed to a purchaser on a sale.

"(3) For the purpose of showing that this section does not apply a statutory declaration or such other evidence as the Land Commission may require shall be *prima facie* evidence.

"(4) This Section shall not extend to a mortgage or a marriage or other family settlement or arrangement."—(*Mr. G. W. Balfour.*)

—brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

Discussion:—

The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. G. W. Balfour, Leeds, Central) 135
Mr. Dillon 136
Mr. Flynn 137
Sir J. Colomb (Great Yarmouth) 138
Mr. G. W. Balfour 138
Serjeant Hemphill 139
Mr. Herbert Lewis 139
Mr. Power (Waterford) 139

Question put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 2, after the word 'which,' to insert the words 'or any estate equivalent to a perpetual estate or interest within the meaning of 1 and 2 Vic., c. 109.'"—(*Serjt. Hemphill.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.) ... 140

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 2, to leave out from the word 'charge' to the word 'been,' in line 4."—(*Mr. Flynn.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Mr. G. W. Balfour ... 141
Mr. Dillon 141
Serjt. Hemphill 142

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 122; Noes, 88. (Division List No. 221

July 16.] *Page*

Amendment proposed—

"In line 8, to leave out from the word 'before,' to the word 'been' in line 9, and insert the words 'the passing of this Act,' instead thereof."—(*Mr. Flynn.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. G. W. Balfour ... 146 *Mr. Dillon* 146

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 140 ; Noes, 96. (Division List No. 222.)

Clause, as amended, added.

Schedule :—

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 8, to leave out from beginning of line to end of Schedule."—(*Mr. G. W. Balfour.*)

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. Edmund Robertson, (Dundee) ... ... 149 *Mr. Atkinson* 150

Amendment agreed to.

Schedule, as amended, agreed to.

Bill reported ; as amended, considered.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a third time."

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Mr. Asquith.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the question."

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. A. J. Balfour... ... 158 *Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S)* 175
Mr. Dillon... ... ... 163 *Mr. Flynn* 178
Mr. T. P. O'Connor 180

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 110 ; Noes, 74. (Division List No. 223.)

Main Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 94 ; Noes, 58. (Division List No. 224.)

Bill read the third time, and passed.

Factories and Workshops Bill—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged ; Bill withdrawn 187

Youthful Offenders Bill [Lords]—Order for resuming adjourned Debate on Amendment to Second Reading [21st May] read, and discharged ; Bill withdrawn 187

Savings Banks and Friendly Societies Bill—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged ; Bill withdrawn 187

Dogs Regulation Bill—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged ; Bill withdrawn 187

July 16.] *Page*

Education Scotland Bill [Lords]—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged; Bill withdrawn 187

Palatine Court of Durham Bill [Lords]—Order for resuming adjourned Debate on Second Reading [2nd April] read, and discharged; Bill withdrawn 187

Reformatory and Industrial Schools (Scotland) Bill—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged; Bill withdrawn 187

Lunacy Bill [Lords]—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged; Bill withdrawn 187

Military Manœuvres Bill [Lords]—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged; Bill withdrawn 187

In pursuance of the Order of the House of this day, Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put... 187

Adjourned at a quarter before Two of the clock.

LORDS: TUESDAY, 17TH JULY, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the following Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—London (St. Luke) Provisional Order; London (Southwark) Provisional Order; the same were ordered to lie on the Table 189

Great Western Railway Bill—The Queen's consent, and the consent of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales in right of his Duchy of Cornwall, signified; and Bill reported from the Select Committee with Amendments.

Aberdeen Corporation Tramways Bill; Cumberland County Council (Bridges Bill; reported with Amendments 189

London and North Western Railway (Wales) Bill—Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the considerstion of the Bill, the opposition thereto having been withdrawn; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. The Orders made on the 25th of June and 6th July last discharged, and Bill committed 189

Great Indian Peninsula Railway Company Bill—Moved, That the Order made on the 12th day of March last, "That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after Tuesday the 26th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2ª; agreed to; Bill read 2ª accordingly 189

Bray Urban District Council Bill—Read 3ª, and passed.

Lancashire, Derbyshire, and East Coast Railway Bill—Read 3ª, with the Amendments; further Amendments made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons 189

July 17.] *Page*

Lambeth Water Bill—Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 190

North Metropolitan Electric Power Supply Bill—South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Bill—Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; and referred to the Examiners 190

Water Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.]—Westgate and Birchington Water Bill [H.L.]—Returned from the Commons agred to 190

Lee Conservancy Bill—North Metropolitan Railway and Canal Bill—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 190

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]—Falkirk and District Water Bill [H.L.]—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments ... 190

Hamilton, Motherwell, and Wishaw Tramways Bill — Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to, with an Amendment ... 190

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill—Committed to a Committee of the whole House 190

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 14) Bill—Committed: The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 190

Local Government Provisional Orders No. 10 Bill—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 13) Bill—Local Government Provisional Order (Housing of Working Classes) Bill—House in Committee (according to Order); Bills reported without amendment; Standing Committee negatived; and Bills to be read 3ª on Thursday next 190

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill—Amendments reported (according to Order), and Bill to be read 3ª on Thursday next ... 191

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill—Read 3ª (according to Orders, and passed... 191

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill—Read 3ª (according to Order), with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 191

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) Bill; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill—Read 3ª (according to Order), and passed 191

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill — Amendments reported (according to Order), and Bill to be read 3ª on Thursday next ... 191

London (Clerkenwell and Holborn) Provisional Order Bill; London (Poplar) Provisional Order Bill—House in Committee (according to Order; Bills reported without Amendment; Standing Committee negatived; and Bills to be read 3ª on Thursday next 191

East London Water Bill; Rochdale Corporation Bill; West Ham Corporation Bill; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill; Plymouth, Stonehouse, and Devonport Tramways Bill; Croydon Tramways and Improvements Bill; London County Tramways (No. 2) Bill; London County Tramways (No. 1) Bill; Kingscourt, Keady, and Armagh Railway Bill; Newry, Keady, and Tynan Light Railway Bill; Great Northern Railway (Ireland) Bill — Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Earl Temple be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bills, in the place of the Lord Stanmore; read, and agreed to 191

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS—I. Annual Series :—No. 2474. Italy (Sardinia); No. 2475. Brazil (Rio de Janeiro); No. 2476. United States (Boston); No. 2477. Turkey (Erzeroum); No. 2478. China (Chefoo).

II. Miscellaneous Series :—No. 534. Present state of Belgian coal, metal, and glass industries 192

CAPE COLONY—Correspondence relating to the affairs of the Cape Colony. Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 192

Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension Bill—Returned from the Commons with the Amendment agreed to 192

Poor Removal Bill—Reported from the Standing Committee without amendment, and to be read 3ª on Thursday next 192

Diocesan Registration Bill [H.L.]—Reported from the Standing Committee without further amendment; the Report of the Amendments made in Committee of the whole House to be received on Thursday next 192

Beer Retailers' and Spirit Grocers' Licences (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill—Reported from the Standing Committee without further amendment; the Report of the Amendments made in Committee of the whole House to be received on Monday next 192

Charitable Loans (Ireland) Bill—Reported from the Standing Committee without amendment, and to be read 3ª on Thursday next 192

Cruelty to Wild Animals in Captivity Bill—Reported from the Standing Committee without further amendment: the Report of the Amendments made in Committee of the whole House to be received on Tuesday next 193

Merchant Shipping (Liability of Shipowners and others) Bill—Reported from the Standing Committee without further amendment; the Report of the Amendment made in Committee of the whole House to be received on Thursday next 193

Members of Local Authorities Relief Bill [H.L.]—Reported from the Standing Committee with further Amendments; the Report of the Amendments made in Committee of the whole House and by the Standing Committee, to be received on Thursday next; and Bill to be printed as amended. (No. 189) 193

County Courts (Ireland) Bill [H.L.]; Veterinary Surgeons (Amendments) Bill—Reported from the Standing Committee without amendment, to be read 3ª on Thursday next 193

Tithe Rent-Charge (Ireland) Bill—Brought from the Commons. Read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª on Thursday next.—(*The Lord Ashbourne.*) (No. 190) 193

County and Borough Franchise Assimilation (London) Bill—[SECOND READING.)—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Lord Farquhar.*)

Lord Tweedmouth ... ... 194 *Lord James of Hereford*... ... 195

On Question, agreed to. Bill read 2ª accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the whole House on Friday next.

ATTENDANCE OF PEERS ON COMMITTEES.

The Earl of Camperdown 196

Moved, for a Return showing the attendance of individual Peers on Select Committees in 1897, 1898, 1899; and distinguishing Committees on Private Bills.—(*Earl of Camperdown.*)

On Question, agreed to.

Return ordered to be laid before the House.

WAR OFFICE RECONSTRUCTION AND ARMY REORGANISATION—

DISCUSSION :—

The Duke of Bedford ... 196
The Secretary of State for War (The Marquess of Lansdowne) 199
Earl Spencer 202
The Earl of Wemyss 203
Lord Tweedmouth 204
The Marquess of Granby ... 204
Lord Heneage 205
The Marquess of Lansdowne ... 206

GIBRALTAR, MALTA, AND HONG KONG—DOCK ACCOMMODATION—NEW WORKS—

DISCUSSION :—

Viscount Sidmouth... ... 207
The Earl of Hopetoun ... 208
Earl Spencer 208

DEATH CERTIFICATION—

DISCUSSION :—

Lord Monkswell 209
Lord Harris 210

House adjourned at Five minutes before Six of the clock.

COMMONS: TUESDAY, 17TH JULY, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Gas Order Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [Lords]. (BY ORDER)—Order read for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment to Question [3rd July], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

And which Amendment was—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Mr. Doogan.*)

Question again proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Debate resumed.

DISCUSSION :—

The Secretary to the Local Government Board (Mr. T. W. Russell, Tyrone, S.) 212
Mr. Dillon (Mayo, E.) ... 212
Mr. Samuel Young (Cavan, E.) 213
The Under Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Jesse Collings, Birmingham, Bordesley) 213
The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Macartney, Antrim, S.)... 214

July 17.] *Page*

Question put, and negatived.

Words added.

Main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to. Second Reading put off for three months.

PRIVATE BILLS [Lords] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH)—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz. :—Bournemouth Corporation Bill [Lords]. Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time 215

Aston Manor Tramways Bill [Lords]—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 215

Great Grimsby Street Tramways Bill [Lords]; Margate Pier and Harbour Bill [Lords]; Mersey Railway Bill [Lords]; Rawmarsh Urban District Council (Tramways) Bill [Lords]—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 215

Edinburgh Corporation Bill [Lords] (by Order)—As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time 215

North Metropolitan Electric Power Supply Bill (by Order)—Ordered, That, in the case of the North Metropolitan Electric Power Supply Bill, Standing Order 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time."—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time and passed 215

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [Lords]—Read a second time, and committed 215

Ramsgate Corporation Improvements Bill [Lords] — Reported with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed ... 215

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill [Lords]—Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill to be read the third time to-morrow 215

Hammond (G. H.) Company Bill [Lords]—Reported, without Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill to be read the third time 216

London and San Francisco Bank Bill [Lords]—Reported, without Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill to be read the third time ... 216

North British Railway Bill [Lords]; Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway Bill [Lords]; South Shields Corporation Bill [Lords]—Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed ... 216

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS—That they have agreed to—Belfast and County Down Railway Bill, with an Amendment.

That they have agreed to—Jarrow and Hebburn Electricity Supply Bill and Hastings Tramways Bill, with Amendments.

That they have agreed to Amendments to—Donegal Railway Bill [Lords] and Great Southern and Western Railway Bill [Lords], without Amendment. 216

PETITIONS.

Education (Scotland) Bill—Petition from Inverness, against; to lie upon the Table 216

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children (No. 2) Bill—Petitions in favour, from Carlton; South Shields (two); Staithes; Loftus; and Bradford; to lie upon the Table 216

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Medical and Sanitary Arrangements at the Cape—Return [presented 16th July] to be printed. [No. 279.] 216

Cape Colony—Copy presented, of Correspondence relating to Affairs of the Cape Colony [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 217

Civil Services (Supplementary Estimate, 1900-1901)—Estimate presented, of the further sums required to be voted for the service of the year ending 31st March, 1901 [by Command]; Referred to the Committee of Supply, and to be printed. [No. 280] 217

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 3) Bill—Copy ordered, "of Memorandum stating the nature of the Proposals contained in the Provisional Orders included in the Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 3) Bill."—(*Mr. Ritchie*) 217

Bankruptcy (Ireland)—Return ordered, "of Bankruptcy Cases closed by each of the Official Assignees in Ireland for the year ended the 31st day of December, 1899, showing—

Number of cases.	Class.	Gross receipts.	Payments to secured creditors.	Preferential payments for rents, taxes, salaries, and allowance to Bankrupt.	Legal and other charges.	Remuneration to Official Assignee.	Dividends.	Balance.	Bankrupt's Statement.		Amount of proofs admitted.
	Gross assets.								Assets.	Liabilities.	
1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.

—(*Mr. Field.*)

QUESTIONS.

China—Anti-Foreign Outbreak—Recent News—Questions, Sir Henry Fowler (Wolverhampton, E.), and Mr. Pritchard Morgan (Merthyr Tydvil); Answers, The Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) 218

July 17.] *Page*

Despatch of Indian Troops to China—Questions, Mr. Maclean (Cardiff), Mr. Buchanan (Aberdeenshire, E.), and Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.); Answers, The Secretary of State for India (Lord G. Hamilton, Middlesex, Ealing)... 218

The Yang-Tse Cable—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Sir M. Hicks-Beach, Bristol, W.) 219

South African War—Compensation to Loyalists in Natal—Question, Sir Andrew Scoble (Hackney, Central); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. J. Chamberlain, Birmingham, W.) 220

Martial Law—Administration—Questions, Mr. Humphreys-Owen (Montgomeryshire), and Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answers, Mr. J. Chamberlain ... 221

Court-Martial Sentences—Question, Mr. Humphreys-Owen; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for War (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 221

Hospital and Medical Arrangements — Committee of Inquiry—Questions, Mr. Burdett-Coutts (Westminster), and Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answers and Statement, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 222

Pretoria—Attempt to blow up Magazine—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien (Kilkenny); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 224

Royal Artillery—Second Lieutenants—Question, Mr. Bartley (Islington, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 225

Line Regiments—Band and Mess Expenses—Question, Mr. Rentoul (Down, E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 225

Militia—Furlough Pay—Question, Sir John Dorrington (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 225

Navy—Cordite Powder—Erosion of Guns—Questions, Sir Charles Dilke and Mr. Paulton (Durham, Bishop Auckland); Answer, Mr. Wyndham ... 226

Picric Acid—Question, Sir Charles Dilke; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 226

Admiralty Coal Contracts—Question, Mr. D. A. Thomas (Merthyr Tydvil); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Macartney, Antrim, S.) ... 227

Belleville Boilers—Admiralty Tests—Questions, Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis), and Sir Fortescue Flannery (Yorkshire, Shipley); Answers, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Goschen, St. George's, Hanover Square)... 227

Belleville Boilers—Use in the Mercantile Marine—Question, Mr. David MacIver (Liverpool, Kirkdale); Answer, The Under Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Jesse Collings, Birmingham, Bordesley) 229

Ashanti—Native Rising—Relief of Coomassie—Question, Mr. Drage (Derby); Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain 230

India—Education—Question, Sir Mancherjee Bhownaggree (Bethnal Green, N.E.); Answer, Lord G. Hamilton 230

July 17.] *Page*

JAMAICA RAILWAY DEBENTURES—INCOME TAX—Question, Mr. Bartley; Answer, Sir M. Hicks Beach 231

INCOME TAX—DEDUCTIONS—Question, Mr. Maclean; Answer, Sir M. Hicks-Beach 231

WILLESDEN POOR LAW CHILDREN—RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION—Question, Mr. Talbot (Oxford University); Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Chaplin, Lincolnshire, Sleaford) 232

DUKINFIELD POSTMASTERSHIP—Question, Mr. M'Ghee (Louth, S.); Answer, The Financial Secretary to The Treasury (Mr. Hanbury, Preston) ... 233

LIVERPOOL TELEGRAPHISTS—PROMOTIONS—Question, Mr. M'Ghee; Answer, Mr. Hanbury 233

HISTORICAL MANUSCRIPTS COMMISSION—Question, Sir Henry Fowler; Answer, Mr. Hanbury. 234

JURY SERVICE -EXEMPTION PAYMENT—Question, Mr. Billson; Answer, Mr. Jesse Collings 235

PRIVATE BILL LEGISLATION—COST—RETURN—Question, Mr. D. A. Thomas; Answer, Mr. Jesse Collings 235

VICTORIA AND ALBERT MUSEUM—ASSISTANTSHIPS—Question, Mr. F. D. Smith (Westminster); Answer, The Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education (Sir J. Gorst, Cambridge University) 235

BOARDING OUT OF PAUPER CHILDREN—Question, Mr. Lawrence (Liverpool, Abercromby); Answer, Sir J. Gorst 236

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND)—FEE GRANT—Question, Mr. Caldwell (Lanarkshire, Mid); Answer, Sir M. Hicks-Beach 236

DUBLIN LAND COMMISSION—THE ULSTER CUSTOM—Question, Mr. Samuel Young (Cavan, E.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. G. W. Balfour, Leeds, Central) 237

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—INSPECTOR GENERAL—Questions, Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N.), Mr. Swift MacNeill and Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.E.); Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour... 238

DOWNPATRICK POSTMASTERSHIP—Question, Mr. Rentoul; Answer, Mr. Hanbury 239

CLONES LEVEL CROSSING—Question, Mr. Macaleese (Monaghan N.); Answer, Mr Jesse Collings 239

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—Questions, Mr. Buchanan and Sir Henry Fowler; Answers, Mr. Hanbury and Mr. A. J. Balfour 239

PUBLIC BUSINESS.

NEW BILLS.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT (1888) AMENDMENT (LONDON)—Bill to amend the Local Government Act, 1881, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Herbert Robertson, Sir Andrew Scoble, and Mr. Bousfield.

July 17.] *Page*

Local Government Act (1888) Amendment (London) Bill—"To amend the Local Government Act, 1888," presented, and read the first time ; to be read a second time upon Thursday, 2nd August, and to be printed. [Bill 302.] 241

NAVAL RESERVE—Bill to make further provision for a Naval Reserve, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Macartney, Mr. Goschen, and Mr. Attorney General.

Naval Reserve Bill—"To make further provision for a Naval Reserve," presented, and read the first time ; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 303.] 241

SUPPLY [19TH ALLOTTED DAY]—Considered in Committee.

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1900–1901 (including Supplementary Estimate).

1. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £6,739,000.(including an additional sum of £410,000), be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Expense of the Contract Work for Shipbuilding, Repairs, etc., which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901."

DISCUSSION :—

The First Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Goschen, St. George's, Hanover Square) 241
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs) ... 261
Sir Fortescue Flannery (Yorkshire, Shipley) 262
Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) ... 271
Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis) 277
Mr. Allan (Gateshead) ... 287
Admiral Field (Sussex, Eastbourne) 291
Mr. C. H. Wilson (Hull, W.) 294
Sir Edward Gourley (Sunderland) 299
Sir J. Colomb (Great Yarmouth) 302
Mr. Harwood (Bolton) 303
Capt. Phillpotts (Devonshire, Torquay) 309
Sir U. Kay-Shuttleworth (Lancs., Clitheroe) 314
Mr. Arnold-Forster (Belfast, W.) 317
Mr. Mather (Lancashire, Rossendale) 324
Mr. John Penn (Lewisham) ... 328
Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee) 328
Mr. David MacIver (Liverpool, Kirkdale) 330
Mr. Goschen 332
Mr. Joseph Walton (Yorkshire, W.R., Barnsley) 334

Question put, and agreed to.

2. £4,139,100 for Shipbuilding, Repairs, Maintenance, etc.—Materiel.

3. £2,523,000, for Shipbuilding, Repairs, Maintenance, etc.—Personnel.

Mr. Kearley (Devonport) ... 336
Mr. Goschen 336

Vote agreed to.

4. £793,200 (Additional) Navy (Supplementary).

DISCUSSION :—

Sir Charles Dilke 336
Admiral Field 337
Sir J. Colomb 337
The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Macartney, Antrim, N.) ... 337

Vote agreed to.

July 17.] *Page*

5. £267,100, Admiralty Office.

DISCUSSION :—

Sir J. Colomb 338
The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 339
Admiral Field 339
The Earl of Dalkeith (Roxburghshire) 340
Mr. Goschen 340

Vote agreed to.

Resolutions to be reported To-morrow ; Committee to sit again To-morrow.

In pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th day of this instant July, Mr. Speaker adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at ten minutes before One of the clock.

COMMONS: WEDNESDAY, 18TH JULY, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Wellingborough and District Tramroads Bill—Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to 341

Gwyrfai Rural District Council Water Bill [Lords]—By Order (Queen's consent signified) ; read the third time, and passed, with Amendments ... 341

Bury and District Water (Transfer) Bill [Lords]—As amended, considered ; to be read the third time 341

Buenos Ayres and Rosario Railway Bill [Lords] ; Costa Rica Railway Company, Limited, Bill [Lords] ; Roe's Patent Bill [Lords]—Read a second time, and committed 341

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill [Lords]—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment 341

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill [Lords]—Ordered, That in the case of the Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill [Lords], Standing Order 126 be suspended, and that the Committee have leave to proceed with the Bill To-morrow.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means*) 341

Walsall Corporation Bill [Lords] ; North Eastern Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill [Lords]—Reported, with Amendments ; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 341

London, Walthamstow, and Epping Forest Railway (Abandonment) Bill—Reported, without amendment ; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 341

North Eastern Railway Bill [Lords]—Reported, with Amendments ; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 341

Railway Bills (Group 8)—Sir LEWIS M'IVER reported from the Committee on Group 8 of Railway Bills, That Mr. Nicholson, one of the Members of the said Committee, was not present during the sitting of the Committee this day ; Report to lie upon Table 342

Glasgow District Tramways Bill [Lords]—Ordered, That the Minutes of Evidence taken before the Committee on the Glasgow District Tramways Bill [Lords], of the present session, be referred to the Committee on Group 8 of Railway Bills.—(*Mr. Caldwell*) 342

PETITIONS.

Education (Scotland) Bill—Petition from Oban, against; to lie upon the Table 342

Public Libraries Bill—Petition from Battersea, in favour; to lie upon the Table 342

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday Bill—Petition from Saltney, in favour; to lie upon the Table 342

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children (No. 2) Bill—Petition from Chester, in favour; to lie upon the Table 342

Sunday Closing (Monmouthshire) Bill—Petitions in favour, from Chester; and Saltney; to lie upon the Table 342

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Workmen's Compensation Act, 1897 (Army and Navy Service) (Men Employed)—Return [presented 16th July] to be printed. [No. 282.] ... 342

Queen's College (Cork)—Copy presented, of Report of the President for the Session 1899–1900, with Appendices [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 342

Local Taxation (Ireland) Returns—Copy presented, of Returns for a portion of the year 1898–99 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table ... 343

Metropolitan Water Supply (Royal Commission)—Copy presented, of Maps, Plans, and Diagrams to accompany the Minutes of Evidence and Report of Her Majesty's Commissioners appointed to inquire into the subject of the water supply within the limits of the Metropolitan Water Companies [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 343

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 3) Bill—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 17th July; *Mr. Ritchie*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 283] 343

Trade Reports (Annual Series) — Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 2474 to 2478 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 343

Trade Reports (Miscellaneous Series)—Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Miscellaneous Series, No. 534 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 343

East India Revenue Accounts — Ordered, That the several Accounts and Papers which have been presented to the House in this Session of Parliament relating to the Revenues of India be referred to the consideration of a Committee of the whole House. Resolved, That this House will, upon Thursday the 26th day of this instant July, resolve itself into the said Committee.—(*Secretary, Lord George Hamilton*) 343

Selection (Standing Committees) — Mr. Halsey reported from the Committee of Selection, That they had discharged the following Members from the Standing Committee on Law and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure, at the conclusion of the Elementary Education Bill:—Mr. Loder, Viscount Cranborne, and Colonel Milward; and had appointed in

substitution: Mr. H. S. Foster, Mr. Yerburgh, and Mr. Flower. Mr. Halsey further reported from the Committee of Selection, That they had discharged the following member from the Standing Committee on Law and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure:—The Lord Advocate, and had appointed in substitution: Mr. T. W. Russell; Reports to lie upon the Table 344

Factory and Workshop Act (1878) Amendment (No. 2) Bill—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 344

Volunteers Bill [Lords]—[SECOND READING]—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Wyndham.*)

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Mr. Arnold-Forster.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

DISCUSSION:—

Capt. Norton (*Newington, W.*) 362
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (*Stirling Burghs*) ... 365
Sir J. Colomb (*Great Yarmouth*) 371
Mr. Hedderwick (*Wick Burghs*) 375
General Goldsworthy (*Hammersmith*) 376
Capt. Sinclair (*Forfarshire*) 377
Mr. Seely (*Lincoln*) 379
Mr. Warner (*Staffordshire, Lichfield*) 380
The Under Secretary of State for War (*Mr. Wyndham, Dover*)... 382
Sir Henry Fletcher (*Sussex, Lewes*) 383
Commander Bethell (*Yorkshire, E. R., Holderness*) 383
Sir Henry Fowler (*Wolverhampton, E.*) 385
Mr. John Burns (*Battersea*) ... 385

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Main question put, and agreed to. Bill read a second time, and committed for To-morrow.

Reserve Forces Bill [Lords]—[SECOND READING.]—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Wyndham.*)

Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (*Stirling Burghs*) ... 386
Mr. Warner (*Staffordshire, Lichfield*) 387

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed for To-morrow.

Post Office Sites (Re-Committed) Bill—Considered in Committee—(In the Committee.)

[Mr. GRANT LAWSON (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) in the Chair.]

Clause 1:—

Question again proposed, "That Clause 1 stand part of the Bill."

July 18.] *Page*

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. Caldwell (*Lanarkshire, Mid*) 387
The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (*Mr. Hanbury, Preston*) 388
Mr. Jonathan Samuel (*Stockton*) 389
Mr. Rickett (*Lincolnshire, Brigg*) 389
Mr. Caldwell 390

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 159 ; Noes, 119. (Division List No. 225.)

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. Caldwell 393
Mr. Dalziel (*Kirkcaldy Burghs*) 394
Mr. Hanbury 394
Mr. John Burns (*Battersea*) ... 395
Mr. Warner 395

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 3 and 4 agreed to.

Clause 5 :—

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. Caldwell 396
Mr. Hanbury 397
Mr. Strachey (*Somersetshire, S.*) 397
Mr. Jonathan Samuel 398

Clause agreed to.

Clause 6 :—

Mr. Caldwell 398
Mr. Hanbury 398

Clause agreed to.

Clause 7 :—

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. Moulton (*Cornwall, Launceston*) 399
Mr. Hanbury 399

Clause agreed to.

Clause 8 agreed to.

Clause 9 :—

Mr. Caldwell 400
Mr. Hanbury 400

Clause agreed to.

Clause 10 :—

Mr. Caldwell 400
Mr. Hanbury 400

Clause agreed to.

Clause 11 :—

Mr. Caldwell 401
Mr. Hanbury 401

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 12, 13, 14, and 15 agreed to.

Bill reported, with Amendment ; to be read the third time To-morrow.

County Courts (Investment of Deposits) Bill [Lords]—Considered in Committee, and reported ; as amended, to be considered To-morrow ... 402

Lunacy Board (Scotland) (Salaries, etc.) Bill—Considered in Committee, and reported; as amended, to be considered To-morrow 402

Oil in Tobacco Bill (Second Reading)—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. Caldwell ... ... 402 *The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Sir M. Hicks-Beach, Bristol, W.)* 402

Question proposed.

Bill read a second time, and committed for To-morrow.

Inebriates Amendment (Scotland) Bill—Order read for resuming adjourned Debate on Amendment to Question [21st June], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

And which Amendment was—

"To leave out the word 'now' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Question again proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Main Question put, and agreed to. Bill read a second time, and committed for To-morrow... 403

SUPPLY [17TH JULY]—Resolutions reported.

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1900–1901 (including Supplementary Estimate).

1. Sec. 3. "That a sum, not exceeding £6,739,000 (including an additional sum of £410,000), be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Expense of the Contract Work for Shipbuilding, Repairs, etc., which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901."

2. Sec. 2. "That a sum not exceeding £4,109,100 (including an additional sum of £55,100), be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Expense of the Material for Shipbuilding, Repairs, Maintenance, etc., including the cost of Establishments of Dockyards and Naval Yards at Home and Abroad, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901."

3. Sec. 1. "That a sum, not exceeding £2,523,000 (including an additional sum of £11,000), be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Expense of the Personnel for Shipbuilding, Repairs, Maintenance, etc., including the cost of Establishments of Dockyards and Naval Yards at Home and Abroad, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901.

4. "That an additional sum, not exceeding £793,200, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for additional Expenditure on the following Navy Services, viz.:—

	£
"Vote 9. Naval Armaments	753,200
"Vote 10. Works, Buildings, and Repairs at Home and Abroad	40,000
Total	£793,200'

July 18.] *Page*

5. "That a sum, not exceeding £267,100, be granted to Her Majesty to defray the Expenses of the Admiralty Office, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901."

Resolutions read a second time.

First Resolution agreed to.

Second Resolution:—

Motion made, and Question put, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution" 403

The House divided:—Ayes, 180; Noes, 32. (Division List No. 226.)

Third Resolution agreed to.

Fourth Resolution:—

Motion made, and Question put, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution" 404

The House divided:— Ayes, 182; Noes, 25. (Division List No. 227.)

Fifth Resolution:—

Further consideration deferred till to-morrow.

In pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th day of this instant July, Mr. Speaker adjourned the House without Question put.

House adjourned at a quarter after Six of the clock.

LORDS: THURSDAY, 19TH JULY, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—Durham (County of) Electric Power Supply. Lancashire Electric Power. Also the Certificate that in the case of the following Bill the further proofs required by the Standing Orders Committee have been given;—Plymouth, Stonehouse, and Devonport Tramways. And also the Certificate that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have not been complied with:—North Metropolitan Electric Power Supply. The same were ordered to lie on the Table ... 409

Taunton Corporation Bill—Report of Her Majesty's Attorney-General received, and ordered to lie on the Table 409

London, Walthamstow, and Epping Forest Railway (Abandonment) Bill; North Metropolitan Electric Power Supply Bill—Examiner's Certificates of non-compliance with the Standing Orders referred to the Standing Orders Committees on Monday next 409

Market Weighton Drainage and Navigation Bill—London and North-Western Railway (Wales) Bill—Reported with Amendments 409

London and South-Western Railway Bill—The Queen's consent, and the consent of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales in right of his Duchy of Cornwall, signified, and Bill reported with Amendments 409

Taunton Corporation Bill; Coventry Corporation Bill; Hastings Corporation Bill; Alexandra Park Bill; Southport Corporation Bill—Moved, That the Order made on 12th day of March last, "That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after Tuesday the 26th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bills be now read 2ª; agreed to; and Bills read 2ª accordingly... 410

Taunton Corporation Bill; Coventry Corporation Bill; Hastings Corporation Bill—Committed 410

Alexandra Park Bill—Committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 410

Southport Corporation Bill—Committed 410

Sunderland Corporation Bill [H.L.]—Read 3ª, and passed, and sent to the Commons 410

Great Northern Railway Bill; Midland Railway Bill—Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 410

South-Eastern Metropolitan Tramways Bill—Read 3ª, with the Amendments; further Amendments made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons 410

Portland Urban District Gas Bill—Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 410

Great Indian Peninsula Railway Company Bill—Committed for To-morrow 410

Burnley Corporation Bill [H.L.]—Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to, with an Amendment; and Bill returned to the Commons ... 410

South Staffordshire Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Falkirk and District Water Bill [H.L.]—Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to 411

Hamilton, Motherwell, and Wishaw Tramways Bill—Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to 411

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill [H.L.]—Returned from the Commons agreed to 411

Wellingborough and District Tramroads Bill—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 411

Aston Manor Tramways Bill [H.L.]—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to 411

Gwyrfai Rural District Council Water Bill [H.L.]—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments 411

Kingscourt, Keady, and Armagh Railway Bill—Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, no parties having appeared in opposition thereto; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. The Orders made on the 26th of June and Monday last discharged; and Bill committed for To-morrow 411

Croydon Tramways and Improvements Bill—Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, the opposition thereto having been withdrawn; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. The Orders made on Thursday and Monday last discharged; and Bill committed 411

July 19.] *Page*

Great Northern Railway (Ireland) Bill—Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, no parties having appeared in opposition thereto; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. The Orders made on the 2nd instant and Monday last discharged; and Bill committed 411

London (St. Luke) Provisional Order Bill; London (Southwark) Provisional Order Bill—Moved, That the order made on the 12th day of March last, "That no Provisional Order Confirmation Bill brought before the House of Commons shall be read a second time after Tuesday, the 26th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bills be now read 2ª; agreed to; Bills read 2ª accordingly, and committed to the Committee of the whole House To-morrow 412

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill—House in Committee (according to Order). Bill reported without Amendment; Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow ... 412

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (Housing of Working Classes) Bill; Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (Housing of Working Classes) (No. 2) Bill—House in Committee (according to Order). Bills reported without amendment; Standing Committee negatived; and Bills to be read 3ª To-morrow 412

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 13) Bill; Local Government Provisional Order (Housing of Working Classes) Bill—Read 3ª (according to Order), and passed 412

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill; Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill—Read 3ª (according to Order), with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 412

London (Clerkenwell and Holborn) Provisional Order Bill; London (Poplar) Provisional Order Bill—Read 3ª (according to Order), and passed 413

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill (Chester Rural Order); Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill (Dorchester Order); Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 14) Bill (Torquay Order); Tramways Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill (Weston-super-Mare Order); Tottenham Urban District Council Bill; Bray and Enniskerry Railway Bill; Alexandra Park Bill; Newcastle-upon-Tyne Electric Supply Bill—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the following Lords be proposed to the House to form the select Committee for the consideration of the said Bills, viz.:—E. Carrington, L. Churchill, L. Stanmore, L. Rathmore (chairman), L. Heneage; agreed to; and the said Lords appointed accordingly. The Committee to meet on Tuesday next at Eleven o'clock; and all petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Bills to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Bills 413

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Treaty Series, No. 14 (1900)—Treaty of friendship, commerce and navigation between the United Kingdom and the Republic of Honduras; signed at Guatemala, 21st January, 1887 (ratifications exchanged at Guatemala, 3rd February, 1900); together with an explanatory protocol signed at Guatemala 3rd February, 1900 413

July 19.] *Page*

METROPOLITAN WATER SUPPLY (ROYAL COMMISSION)—Maps, plans and diagrams to accompany the minutes of evidence and report of Her Majesty's Commissioners appointed to inquire into the subject of the water supply within the limits of the Metropolitan Water Companies ... 414

LOCAL TAXATION (IRELAND)—Return for the year 1898–99 414

LAND LAW (IRELAND) ACT, 1887 (EVICTION NOTICES)—Return of the number of eviction notices filed during the quarter ended 30th June, 1900 ... 414

QUEEN'S COLLEGE, CORK—Annual Report of the President, for the session 1899–1900 414

IMPERIAL INSTITUTE (INDIAN SECTION)—Annual Report for the year 1899–1900 414

GREENWICH OBSERVATORY—Report of the Astronomer Royal to the Board of Visitors of the Royal Observatory, Greenwich, read at the annual visitation of the Royal Observatory, 26th June, 1900. Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie upon the Table 414

LAND REGISTRY—Account of receipts and payments in respect of the Land Registry for the year ended 31st March, 1900 414

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE AND COURT OF APPEAL—Account showing the receipts and expenditure in respect of the High Court of Justice and the Court of Appeal during the year ended 31st March, 1900... 414

COURT OF PROBATE DIVISION (HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE) (IRELAND)—Annual account of receipts and disbursements, for the year ending 31st December, 1899 414

SUPERANNUATION—Treasury Minute, dated 29th June, 1900, granting a retired allowance to Mr. Thomas Alfred Inch, a second division clerk (higher grade) under the Board of Trade, under Section 2 of the Superannuation Act, 1887. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 414

HOUSE OF LORDS OFFICES—Second Report from the Select Committee made; to be printed; and to be considered on Tuesday next. (No. 191) ... 415

Copyright (Artistic) Bill [H.L.]—Reported from the Select Committee with Amendments, and committed to a Committee of the whole House on Monday next; and to be printed as amended. (No. 192) 415

Copyright Bill [H.L.]; Copyright (Artistic) Bill [H.L.]—Reported from the Select Committee with the proceedings of the Committee) made, and to be printed (No. 193): Minutes of evidence, together with an appendix, laid upon the Table, and delivered out 415

Poor Removal Bill [THIRD READING]—Order of the Day for the Third Reading read.

Bill read 3ª (according to Order).

Moved—

"In Clause 1, page 1, line 7, after 'the poor' to insert 'provided that such person shall have resided continuously for at least six months in the parish or union from which it is proposed to remove him.'"—(*Lord Davey.*)

July 19.] *Page*

DISCUSSION :—

Lord Morris 416
Lord Avebury 417
Earl Spencer 418
The Earl of Kimberley 418
Lord Harris 419

On Question, Amendment negatived.

Bill passed.

Diocesan Registration Bill [H.L.]—Amendments reported (according to Order), and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow 420

Charitable Loans (Ireland) Bill—Read 3ª (according to Order), and passed 420

Merchant Shipping (Liability of Shipowners and Others) Bill—Amendment reported (according to Order), and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow 420

Members of Local Authorities Relief Bill [H.L.]—Amendments reported (according to Order) : A further amendment made ; and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow 420

County Court (Ireland) Bill [H.L.]—Read 3ª (according to Order), and passed, and sent to the Commons 420

Veterinary Surgeons (Amendment) Bill—Read 3ª (according to Order), and passed 420

Tithe Rent-Charge (Ireland) Bill [SECOND READING]—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Lord Ashbourne.*)

DISCUSSION :—

The Earl of Kimberley ... 425
Lord Clonbrock 427
The Earl of Mayo 430
The Earl of Arran 431
The Marquess of Londonderry ... 432

On Question, agreed to. Bill read 2ª accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the whole House on Monday next.

Land Charges Bill [H.L.]—Commons Amendments considered (according to Order), and agreed to 435

THE RESERVE FORCES OF AUSTRALIA.

DISCUSSION :—

Lord Brassey 435
Viscount Frankfort ... 439
The Secretary of State for War (The Marquess of Lansdowne) 441
Earl Carrington... 447

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL ARRANGEMENTS—COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY—Question, The Earl of Aberdeen ; Answer, The Marquess of Lansdowne 448

House adjourned at ten minutes past Seven of the clock.

COMMONS: THURSDAY, 19TH JULY, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Dearne Valley Railway Bill [Lords]—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment 450

Glyncorrwg Urban District Council Gas Bill [Lords]; London Sea Water Supply Bill [Lords]; Whitechapel and Bow Railway Bill [Lords]—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 450

Workington Railways and Docks Bill [Lords]—Ordered, That, in the case of the Workington Railways and Docks Bill [Lords], Standing Orders 204 and 235 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read a second time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Bill accordingly read a second time, and committed.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 211 and 236 be suspended, and that the Committee on the Bill have leave to sit and proceed upon Monday next.—(*Mr. Caldwell*) 450

London, Walthamstow, and Epping Forest Railway Bill—Order (12th February) referring the London, Walthamstow, and Epping Forest Railway Bill to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.—(*Mr. Caldwell*) 450

Edinburgh (Housing of the Working Classes) Improvement Scheme Provisional Order Bill—Ordered, That Standing Orders 211 and 236 be suspended, and that the Committee of Selection have leave to appoint the Committee on the Bill, to sit and proceed forthwith.—(*The Lord Advocate*) 450

Paisley Waterworks Provisional Order Bill—Ordered, That Standing Orders 211 and 236 be suspended, and that the Committee of Selection have leave to appoint the Committee on the Bill, to sit and proceed forthwith.—(*The Lord Advocate*) 451

RAILWAYS (IRELAND) AMALGAMATION BILLS (JOINT COMMITTEE)—Report from the Joint Committee on Railways (Ireland) Amalgamation Bills in respect of the Great Southern and Western and Waterford and Central Ireland Railway Companies Amalgamation Bill [Lords] (Pending in the Lords) brought up, and read. Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. Report from the Joint Committee on Railways (Ireland) Amalgamation Bills in respect of the Great Southern and Western and Waterford, Limerick, and Western Railway Companies Amalgamation Bill [Lords] (Pending in the Lords), brought up, and read. Report to lie upon the Table and to be printed 451

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS—That they have agreed to—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) Bill; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill; Bray Urban District Council Bill, without Amendment; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill; Lancashire, Derbyshire, and East Coast Railway Bill; Lambeth Water Bill, with Amendments. That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to empower the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the borough of Sunderland to contribute towards the construction by the North Eastern Railway Company of a bridge and road across the River Wear, and to make provision for the construction of a new road in Southwick to join the same; and for other purposes." Sunderland Corporation Bill [Lords] 451

July 19.] *Page*

Sunderland Corporation Bill [Lords]—Read the first time, and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills 452

PETITIONS.

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday Bill—Petition from Lowick, in favour; to lie upon the Table 452

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children (No. 2) Bill—Petitions in favour, from Lowick and Alnwick; to lie upon the Table... 452

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children (Scotland) Bill—Petition from Crieff, in favour; to lie upon the Table 452

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Taxes and Imposts—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 13th March; *Mr. Goddard*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 284.] 452

Whisky in Bond (Scotland)—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 19th June; *Mr. Gordon*]; to lie upon the Table 452

Court of Probate Division (High Court of Justice) (Ireland)—Annual Account presented, of Receipts and Disbursements for the year ended 31st December, 1899 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 452

Land Registry—Account presented, of Receipts and Payments in respect of the Land Registry for the year ended 31st March, 1900 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 285.] 452

High Court of Justice and Court of Appeal, etc.—Copy presented, of Account showing the Receipts and Expenditure in respect of the High Court of Justice and the Court of Appeal during the year ended 31st March, 1900 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 286.] 453

Superannuation Act, 1887—Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 29th June, 1900, granting a retired allowance to Mr. Thomas Alfred Inch, a Second Divisional Clerk (Higher Grade) under the Board of Trade, under the Act [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 453

Imperial Institute (Indian Section)—Copy presented, of Annual Report of Imperial Institute (Indian Section) for the year 1899–1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 453

Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1887 (Eviction Notices)—Copy presented, of Return of Eviction Notices filed during the Quarter ended 30th June, 1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 453

Treaty Series (No. 4, 1906)—Copy presented, of Treaty of Friendship, Commerce, and Navigation between the United Kingdom and the Republic of Honduras. Signed at Guatemala, 22nd January, 1887. (Ratifications exchanged at Guatemala, 3rd February, 1900) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 453

Greenwich Observatory—Copy presented of Report of the Astronomer Royal to the Board of Visitors of the Royal Observatory, Greenwich [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 453

QUESTIONS.

China—Anti-Foreign Outbreak—Assistance to Refugees—Question, Mr. Joseph Walton (Yorkshire W.R., Barnsley); Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) 453

Peking Legation Naval Guard — Question, Sir John Colomb (Great Yarmouth); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Macartney, Antrim, S.) 454

Indian Troops for China—Cost—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.); Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Lord G Hamilton, Middlesex, Ealing)... 455

Japanese Troops for China—Question, Mr. Herbert Roberts (bighshire, W.); Answer, Mr. Brodrick ... ... Don... ... 455

Yang-Tsze Valley—English Support to the Viceroys—Question, Mr. Yerburgh (Chester); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 455

South African War—Treatment of Boers in British Hospitals—Questions, Mr. H. D. Greene (Shrewsbury), and Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answers, The Under-Secretary of State for War (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 456

Transport—Catering Arrangements on the "Custodian."—Question, Mr. Paulton (Durham, Bishop Auckland); Answer, Mr. Macartney ... 457

The "Avondale Castle" Canteen Prices — Question, Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 457

Under-Age Recruits—Private Walsh 1st Munster Fusiliers—Question, Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 458

South Denes Camp, Yarmouth — Collection by the Sisters of Nazareth—Question, Dr. Tanner (Cork Co., Mid); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 458

Boots and Clothing for the Troops—Question, General Russell (Cheltenham); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 459

Colenso Engagement — Colonel Long's Report — Questions, General Russell, and Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answers, Mr. Wyndham 459

3rd Inniskilling Fusiliers—Question, Mr. Macaleese (Monaghan, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 460

Invalided Soldiers—Statistics—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 460

Civil Tribunals at Johannesburg—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. J. Chamberlain, Birmingham, W.) 461

Martial Law—Papers on the Cape Rebels—Question, Mr. Sydney Buxton (Tower Hamlets, Poplar); Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain ... 461

Army Chaplain at Hong Kong—Questions, Mr. Brodie Hoare (Hampstead), and Lord Hugh Cecil (Greenwich); Answers, Mr. Wyndham 462

Sentry Duty in the Metropolis—Question, Major Rasch (Essex, S.E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 462

July 19.] *Page*

OUTLAY UPON BELLEVILLE BOILERS — Questions, Mr. Hedderwick (Wick Burghs), and Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answers, Mr. Macartney 463

BRITISH SOUTH AFRICA COMPANY—REPORTED TRANSFER TO THE CROWN—Question, Mr. Sydney Buxton; Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain 463

BRITISH TRADE IN MADAGASCAR — Mr. D. A. Thomas (Merthyr Tydvil); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 463

CABLE COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE WEST INDIAN ISLANDS—Question, Mr. Tomlinson (Preston); Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain 464

INDIAN FAMINE—LOANS TO NATIVE STATES — Question, Sir William Wedderburn (Banffshire); Answer, Lord G. Hamilton 464

REMISSIONS OF LAND REVENUE—Question, Sir William Wedderburn; Answer, Lord G. Hamilton 465

RAINFALL IN THE FAMINE AREAS—Question, Sir Mancherjee Bhownaggree (Bethnal Green, N.E.); Answer, Lord G. Hamilton 466

CATTLE IN THE FAMINE DISTRICTS—SUPPLIES OF SEED GRAIN, FODDER, ETC. —Question, Mr. C. P. Scott (Lancashire, Leigh); Answer, Lord G. Hamilton 467

CHOLERA IN THE FAMINE DISTRICTS — Question, Mr. C. P. Scott; Answer, Lord G. Hamilton 467

INDIAN PENAL LAWS—Question, Sir William Wedderburn; Answer, Lord G. Hamilton 468

NEW TAXATION IN INDIA SINCE 1886—Question, Sir William Wedderburn; Answer, Lord G. Hamilton 469

THE COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF IN INDIA—Question, Mr. Buchanan (Aberdeenshire, E.); Answer, Lord G. Hamilton 469

SILVER COINAGE—Question, Mr. W. F. D. Smith (Westminster); Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Sir M. Hicks-Beach, Bristol, W.) ... 469

INCOME TAX—INTEREST ON MUNICIPAL LOANS—Questions, Sir Alfred Hickman (Wolverhampton, W.) and Mr. Bartley (Islington, N.); Answers, Sir M. Hicks-Beach 470

PRISON TREATMENT OF DEBTORS—Question, Mr. J. A. Pease (Northumberland, Tyneside); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir M. White-Ridley, Lancashire, Blackpool) 470

METROPOLITAN POLICE FORCE—Question, Capt. Norton (Newington, W.); Answer, Sir M. White-Ridley 471

UNDELIVERED POST CARDS—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien (Kilkenny); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Hanbury, Preston) 471

CENTRAL TELEGRAPHIC OFFICE—OVERTIME—Question, Mr. Woods (Essex, Walthamstow); Answer, Mr. Hanbnry 472

COOTEHILL (CAVAN) POSTMASTERSHIP—Question, Mr. Samuel Young (Cavan, E.); Answer, Mr. Hanbury 472

July 19.] *Page*

NEWBLISS POST OFFICE—Question, Mr. Macaleese; Answer, Mr. Hanbury ... 473

R.I.C. MEDICAL APPOINTMENT FOR TIPPERARY—Question, Mr. T. M. Healy (Louth, N.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. G. W. Balfour, Leeds, Central) 474

GRAZING IN PHŒNIX PARK, DUBLIN—Question, Mr. T. M. Healy; Answer, Mr. Hanbury 475

IRISH BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS—ASSISTANT SURVEYOR OF BUILDINGS—Question, Sir George Fardell (Paddington, S.); Answer, Mr. Hanbury ... 476

TRACTION ENGINES ON IRISH ROADS—Question, Mr. Macaleese; Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour 476

THE BOTANICAL GARDENS, DUBLIN—Question, Mr. T. M. Healy; Answer, Mr. Hanbury 477

SUTTON TO HOWTH TRAMWAY—Question, Mr. T. M. Healy; Answer, Mr. Hanbury 477

LISTOWEL TO TARBERT RAILWAY—Questions, Mr. Flavin and Capt. Donelan (Cork, E.); Answers, Mr. G. W. Balfour 478

POLICE PROTECTION NEAR LISTOWEL—Question, Mr. Flavin; Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour 478

CELTIC MANUSCRIPTS—SALARY OF THE IRISH SCRIBE—Question, Mr. Dillon (Mayo, E.); Answer, Mr. Hanbury 479

MONAGHAN ASYLUM WORKS—Question, Mr. Daly (Monaghan, S.); Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour 480

SNEEM (COUNTY KERRY) POLICE FORCE—Questions, Mr. Flavin and Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.); Answers, Mr G. W. Balfour 481

IRISH EDUCATION—NEW REGULATIONS—Question, Mr. Flynn; Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour 482

EXTRA SUBJECTS—REMUNERATION OF TEACHERS—Question, Mr. William Abraham (Cork County, N. E.); Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour 483

MONITORS IN IRISH NATIONAL SCHOOLS—Question, Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.); Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour 483

IRISH COUNTY SURVEYORS—Question, Mr. Flavin; Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour 483

PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE—STANDING ORDERS—Question, Mr. Carvell Williams (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield); Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 484

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—Questions, Mr. Talbot (Oxford University), Lord Hugh Cecil, Mr. Bryce, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucester, Forest of Dean), Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs), Mr. Warner (Staffordshire, Lichfield), and Mr. Flavin; Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 484

PUBLIC BUSINESS.

Sea Fisheries Bill—Reported from the Select Committee, with Minutes of Evidence; Special Report brought up, and read. Report and Special Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 287.] Bill reported, without amendment... 486

July 19.] *Page*

Companies Bill—Reported from the Standing Committee on Trade, etc., with Amendments.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 288.]

Minutes of Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 288.]

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be considered upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 304.] 486

NEW BILLS.

Elementary School Teachers' Superannuation (Isle of Man)—Bill to extend The Elementary School Teachers' (Superannuation) Act, 1898, to Teachers serving in the Isle of Man and to service as a Teacher in that Island, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Jesse Collings and Secretary Sir Matthew White Ridley.

Elementary School Teachers' Superannuation (Isle of Man) Bill—"To extend the Elementary School Teachers (Superannuation) Act, 1898, to Teachers serving in the Isle of Man and to service as a Teacher in that Island," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 305.] 487

Elementary School Teachers' Superannuation (Jersey)—Bill to extend The Elementary School Teachers (Superannuation) Act, 1898, to Teachers serving in the Island of Jersey and to service as a Teacher in that Island, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Jesse Collings and Secretary Sir Matthew White Ridley.

Elementary School Teachers' Superannuation (Jersey) Bill—"To extend the Elementary School Teachers (Superannuation) Act, 1898, to Teachers serving in the Island of Jersey and to service as a Teacher in that Island," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 306.] 487

Intermediate Education (Ireland) Bill—[Second Reading]—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. G. W. Balfour.*)

Discussion:—

Mr. John Redmond (*Waterford*) 489
Mr. Gibson Bowles (*Lynn Regis*) 495
Mr. T. M. Healy (*Louth, N.*) 497
Mr. Lecky (*Dublin University*) 501
Mr. Dillon (*Mayo, E.*) ... 502
Mr. Rentoul (*Down, E.*) ... 508
Serjeant Hemphill (*Tyrone, N.*) 515
Mr. Clancy (*Dublin County, N.*) 516
Sir James Haslett (*Belfast, N.*) 518
Mr. Harrington (*Dublin Harbour*) 519
Mr. Power (*Waterford, E.*) ... 520
Mr. Field (*Dublin, St. Patrick*) 520
Mr. J. F. X. O'Brien (*Cork*) ... 523
Mr. Shee (*Waterford, W.*) ... 523
Mr. Murnaghan (*Tyrone, Mid.*) 525

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read 2ª and committed for Monday next.

Irish Education Bill—[Second Reading]—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

July 19.] *Page*

DISCUSSION :—

Mr John Redmond (Waterford) 528
Mr. Dillon (Mayo, E.) ... 529
Mr. Lecky (Dublin University) ... 531
Mr. G. W. Balfour 530

Motion for Second Reading, by leave, withdrawn.

Bill withdrawn.

Agricultural Holdings Bill [THIRD READING]—Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a third time."

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Mr. Buchanan.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

DISCUSSION :—

Dr. Farquharson (Aberdeenshire, W.) 537
Major Rasch (Essex, S.E.)... 537
Mr. Lambert (Devonshire, South Molton) 538
Mr. Strutt (Essex, Maldon) 543
Mr. Alfred Thomas (Glamorganshire, E.) ... 544
Mr. Giles (Cambridgeshire, Wisbech) 548
Mr. Brynmor Jones (Swansea Districts) 550
Mr. Ellis Griffith (Anglesey) 557
Mr. Herbert Roberts (Denbighshire, W.) 558
Mr. Channing (Northamptonshire, E.) 561
Col. Kenyon-Slaney (Shropshire, Newport) 566
Mr. Lloyd-George (Carnarvon Boroughs) 569
Mr. Humphreys-Owen (Montgomeryshire) 573
The Attorney-General (Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs) ... 575
Mr. Herbert Lewis (Flint Boroughs) 577

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

Post Office Sites Bill—[THIRD READING]—Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. Caldwell (Lanarkshire, Mid) 582
The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Hanbury, Preston) 582

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

County Courts (Investment of Deposits) Bill [Lords]—Order for consideration, as amended, read.

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. Caldwell 583
Sir Robert Finlay 583

Bill read the third time, and passed.

July 19.] *Page*

Lunacy Board (Scotland) (Salaries, etc.) Bill—Order for consideration, as amended, read.

Mr. Caldwell 583

Bill read the third time, and passed.

Oil in Tobacco Bill—Considered in Committee—(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 :—

Question proposed, "That Clause 1 stand part of the Bill."

Dr. Tanner (*County Mayo, Mid*) 584

Clause agreed to.

Clause 2 :—

Question proposed, "That Clause 2 stand part of the Bill."

Dr. Tanner 584

Clause agreed to.

Bill reported, without Amendment; read the third time, and passed.

Inebriates Amendment (Scotland) Bill [Lords]—Considered in Committee, and reported, with an Amendment.

Bill considered, as amended; read the third time, and passed, with an Amendment 584

Diocesan Records Bill [Lords)—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 584

Railways (Prevention of Accidents) Bill—Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to... 584

Greenwich Hospital—Resolved, That the Statement of the estimated Income and Expenditure of Greenwich Hospital and Travers' Foundation for the year 1900–1901 be approved.—*Mr. Austen Chamberlain*) 584

In pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th day of this instant July, Mr. Speaker adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at five minutes after Twelve of the clock.

LORDS: FRIDAY, 20TH JULY, 1900.

Sat First—The Earl of Strafford sat first in Parliament after the death of his brother 585

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The Lord Chancellor acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with:—South Wales Electrical Power Distribution. And also the Certificate that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with:—London (Marylebone) Provisional Order. The same were ordered to lie on the Table 585

July 20.] *Page*

Exmouth Urban District Water Bill [H.L.] ; Gwyrfai Rural District Council Water Bill [H.L.]—Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to... 585

East London Water Bill — Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 585

City of London (Various Powers) Bill—The Queen's consent signified ; and Bill reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments... ... 585

London and North Western Railway Bill—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 585

London United Tramways Bill—Reported from the Select Committee with Amendments 585

Blackpool, St. Anne's, and Lytham Tramways Bill—Reported, with Amendments 586

Wandsworth, and Putney Gas Bill—Reported from the Select Committee with Amendments 586

Aberdeen Police and Improvement Bill—Reported, with Amendments ... 586

London County Council (Money) Bill—Exeter Corporation Bill—Kingscourt, Keady, and Armagh Railway Bill—Reported, with Amendments ... 586

Great Indian Peninsula Railway Company Bill—Reported, without Amendment 586

Durham (County of) Electric Power Supply Bill—Lancashire Electric Power Bill—Moved, That the Order made on the 12th day of March last, "That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after Tuesday the 26th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bills be now read 2^a ; agreed to ; and Bills read 2^a accordingly 586

Midland Great Western Railway of Ireland Bill [H.L.]—Read 3^a, and passed, and sent to the Commons 586

Dearne Valley Railway Bill [H.L.]—Returned from the Commons agreed to 586

Glyncorrwg Urban District Council Gas Bill [H.L.]—London Sea Water Supply Bill [H.L.]—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments 586

Whitechapel and Bow Railway Bill [H.L.]—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to 586

Great Southern and Western and Waterford, Limerick, and Western Railway Companies Amalgamation Bill [H.L.] ; Great Southern and Western and Waterford, and Central Ireland Railway Companies Amalgamation Bill [H.L.] ; Reported from the Joint Committee with Amendments 587

Great Southern and Western and Waterford, Limerick, and Western Railway Companies Amalgamation Bill [H.L.] ; Midland Great Western Railway of Ireland Bill [H.L.] ; Great Southern and Western and Waterford and Central Ireland Railway Companies Amalgamation Bill [H.L.] Report from the Joint Committee (with the proceedings of the Committee) made, and to be printed. (No. 196) 587

July 20.] *Page*

Edinburgh (Housing of the Working Classes) Improvement Scheme Provisional Order Bill. (No. 201); Paisley Waterworks Provisional Order Bill. (No. 202)—Brought from the Commons, read 1ª, to be printed; and referred to the examiners 587

London (St. Luke) Provisional Order Bill; London (Southwark) provisional Order Bill; House in Committee (according to Order); Bill reported without amendment; Standing Committee negatived; and Bills to be read 3ª on Monday next 587

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill; Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (Housing of Working Classes) Bill; Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (Housing of Working Classes) (No. 2) Bill; Read 3ª (according to Order), and passed ... 587

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]—Commons Amendments considered (according to Order), and agreed to 587

Dublin Corporation Bill—Clontarf Urban District Council Bill—Report from the Joint Committee that the said Bills ought to be allowed to proceed; the proceedings of the Select Committee laid upon the Table, and to be printed. (No. 204) 588

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896—Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of a light railway in the counties of Devon and Cornwall from Bere Alston Station to Calstock, and the working of a portion of the East Cornwall Mineral Railway as a light railway 588

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION—Forty-fourth Report of Her Majesty's Civil Service Commissioners; with Appendix 588

PUBLIC RECORDS (IRELAND)—Thirty-Second Report of the Deputy Keeper of the Records 588

AGRARIAN OUTRAGES (IRELAND)—Return for the quarter ended 30th June, 1900 588

TRADE REPORTS—ANNUAL SERIES—No. 2479. Argentine Republic (Agricultural and commercial condition); No. 2480, Argentine Republic (Buenos Ayres); No. 2481, Chile; No. 2482, Greece (Finances); No. 2483, Austria-Hungary.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 588

TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION ACT, 1889—Minute by the Board of Education sanctioning the subjects to be taught under Clause 8 of the Act, for the county of Middlesex (fifth minute). Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 588

Railways (Prevention of Accidents) Bill—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 589

Inebriates Amendment (Scotland) Bill [H.L.] — Returned from the Commons agreed to, with an Amendment; the said Amendment to be printed, and to be considered on Tuesday next. (No. 194.) 589

County Courts (Investment of Deposits) Bill [H.L.]—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments; the said Amendments to be printed. (No. 195.) 589

July 20.] *Page*

Agricultural Holdings Bill—Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª on Tuesday next (The Lord Privy Seal [*V. Cross.*]) (No. 197.) 589

Lunacy Board (Scotland) Salaries, etc., Bill—Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª on Tuesday next (The Lord Balfour). (No. 198.) 589

Oil in Tobacco Bill—Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; and to be printed. (No. 199.) 589

Post Office Sites Bill—Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners. (No. 200.)... 589

County and Borough Franchise Assimilation (London) Bill—House in Committee (according to Order); Bill reported without Amendment; and re-committed to the Standing Committee 589

Town Councils (Scotland) Bill—House in Committee (according to Order).

Clause 4 :—

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 4, page 1, line 24, to leave out from 'burgh of regality' to end of clause, and to insert 'police burgh and any other burgh within the meaning of the Burgh Police (Scotland) Act, 1892, to which that Act applied from its commencement.'"—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 4, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 5 to 8 agreed to.

Clause 9 :—

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 9, page 3, line 36, to leave out 'shall' and to insert 'may.'"—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 9, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 10 to 12 agreed to.

Clause 13 :—

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 13, page 5, line 20, to leave out Sub-section (*a*)."—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

Amendment agreed to—

Clause 13, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 14 :—

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 14, page 5, line 38, to leave out from end of line to end of clause, and to insert 'until (1) he voluntarily resigns; or (2) his disqualification has been determined by an election court under and within the meaning of the Elections (Scotland) (Corrupt and Illegal Practices) Act, 1890, on a petition presented within the time specified by the said Act, by the town council or by any four or more electors, or, in the case of disqualification alleged to exist at the time of nomination or election, by any candidate opposing him at the election, provided that the last-mentioned Act shall be held to apply to

the said petition and procedure thereon, provided that in the case of any continuing disqualification it shall be competent to present such petition at any time while the disqualification subsists; and provided also that if in the opinion of the election court any disqualified person has in the knowledge of his disqualification made an oath or declaration *de fideli*, or taken his seat in the town council, it shall be in the power of the Court to impose on him a fine not exceeding one hundred pounds, which fine shall be paid to the town council, and applied in such manner as they may direct; or (3) a resolution declaring his office vacant has been passed by the town council at a meeting of which notice shall be given to the councillor in question and to the other councillors of the burgh at least three days before the date of such meeting; provided that the said councillor shall be entitled to appeal against any such resolution by lodging a note of appeal within fourteen days after the date of such resolution in manner provided by Section 339 of the Burgh Police (Scotland) Act, 1892; and provided, further, that no such appeal shall entitle the said councillor to vote and act as a councillor while the same is pending.'"—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 14, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 15 to 22 agreed to.

Clause 23:—

Amendment moved.

"In Clause 23, page 8, line 10, after 'another' to insert 'or their residing more than seven miles beyond some part of the municipal boundary.'"—(*The Earl of Camperdown.*)

Lord Balfour of Burleigh 592

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 23, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 24 to 35 agreed to.

Clause 36:—

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 36, page 12, line 18, at end of clause to insert 'provided that any vacancy so occurring may, if the town council so resolve, be filled up *ad interim* as soon as may be by a special election by the electors, and such election shall be held as nearly as may be under the provisions of this Act, and the returning officer at such election shall, subject to the approval of the town council, fix the date of the election, and shall fix the dates for the issue of all necessary notices and for lodging and withdrawing nomination papers, so that the intervals between such respective dates shall be the same as in the case of ordinary elections under this Act.'"—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 36, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 37 to 60 agreed to.

Clause 61:

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 61, page 17, line 31, after 'office' to insert 'under this Act or the Burgh Police (Scotland) Act, 1892.'"—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 61, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 62 to 87 agreed to.

July 20.] *Page*

Clause 88 :—

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 88, page 24, line 25, after 'levied' to insert 'or funds managed.'"—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 88, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 89 to 101 agreed to.

Clause 102 :—

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 102, page 29, line 10, at end of clause to insert 'and in any burgh where under the existing law it has been the custom of the town council to appoint a councillor to perform the duties and functions formerly performed by the dean of guild in such council, or in any dean of guild court of such burgh, the council may continue to make such an appointment, and the whole provisions of this Act relating to the appointment, tenure, vacating office, and supply of vacancies applicable to a bailie shall be applicable to the councillor so appointed.'"—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 102, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 103 to 108 agreed to.

Clause 109 amended, and agreed to.

Clause 110 to 115 agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"To insert as a new clause, 'Nothing in this Act contained shall affect the rights, powers, or authorities of any county council or district committee of a county council or local authority of a county or a district of a county under the Public Health (Scotland) Act, 1897; or prejudice the provisions of Sub-sections 1 and 2 of Section 81 of the Local Government (Scotland) Act, 1889, as amended by Section 44 of the Local Government (Scotland) Act, 1894.'"—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

New Clause agreed to.

Bill re-committed to the Standing Committee; and to be printed as amended. (No. 203.)... 594

INDIAN EXPENDITURE—REPORT OF THE ROYAL COMMISSION—Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for copies of any correspondence between the Secretary of State for India in Council and the Treasury on the subject of the Report of the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure."—(*The Earl of Northbrook.*)

DISCUSSION :—

Lord Welby 601
The Earl of Onslow ... 605
The Earl of Kimberley ... 610
The Prime Minister the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (the Marquess of Salisbury) ... 616

On Question, agreed to. Return ordered accordingly.

Executors (Scotland) Bill [SECOND READING]—Order of the Day for Second Reading read.

Lord Balfour of Burleigh 618

Bill read 2ª (according to Order), and committed to a Committee of the whole House on Tuesday next.

July 20.] *Page*

Diocesan Registration Bill [H.L.]—Read 3ª (according to Order), and passed, and sent to the Commons 619

Merchant Shipping (Liability of Shipowners and Others) Bill—Order of the Day for the Third Reading read.

Moved, That the Bill be now read 3ª.—(*Lord Heneage*)

DISCUSSION :—

The Lord Chancellor (The Earl of Halsbury) ... 649 *Lord Heneage* 620

On Question, "That the debate on the said motion be adjourned," resolved in the affirmative, and ordered accordingly ; Bill to be read 3ª on Monday next.

Members of Local Authorities Relief Bill [H.L.]—Read 3ª (according to Order), and passed, and sent to the Commons 621

Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill—[SECOND READING]—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Lord Harris.*)

DISCUSSION :—

Earl Carrington ... ... 627 *The Lord Privy Seal (Viscount Cross)*... 631
The Chairman of Committees (The Earl of Morley) ... 629 *Lord Windsor* 633

On Question, agreed to.

Bill read 2ª accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the whole House on Monday next.

Prohibition of Exportation of Arms Bill [H.L.]—A Bill to amend the law relating to the exportation of arms, ammunition, and military and naval stores—was presented by The Lord Chancellor ; read 1ª ; to be printed ; and to be read 2ª on Monday next. (No. 205) 635

House adjourned at half-past Seven of the clock.

COMMONS: FRIDAY, 20TH JULY, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (NO STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE)—MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, no Standing Orders are applicable, viz. :—Fraser Settled Chattels Bill [Lords]. Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time. 635

Belfast and County Down Railway Bill—Lords Amendment considered, and agreed to 636

Jarrow and Hebburn Electricity Supply Bill ; Nottingham Corporation Bill—Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to 636

Edinburgh Corporation Bill [Lords]—Queen's consent signified ; read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 636

July 20.] *Page*

Great Grimsby Street Tramways Bill [Lords]—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 636

Hammond (G. H.) Company Bill [Lords]; London and San Francisco Bank Bill [Lords]—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment ... 636

Margate Pier and Harbour Bill [Lords]—Queen's consent signified; read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 636

Mersey Railway Bill [Lords]; Rawmarsh Urban District Council (Tramways) Bill [Lords]—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 636

Liverpool Overhead Railway Bill [Lords]—As amendment, considered; to be read the third time 636

Rotherham Corporation Bill [Lords] **(By Order)**—As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time 636

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 12) **Bill**—Lords Amendments considered and agreed to 637

Edinburgh (Housing of the Working Classes) Improvements Scheme Provisional Order Bill—Reported; without Amendment [Provisional Orher confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table—Bill read the third time, and passed 637

Paisley Waterworks Provisional Order Bill—Reported without amendment [Provisional Order confirmed]: Report to lie upon the Table. Bill read the third time, and passed 637

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) **Bill** [Lords]—Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. Bill, as amended, to be considered upon Monday next 637

Railways (Ireland) Amalgamation Bill—Minutes of Proceedings of the Joint Committee to be printed. [No 293].... 637

Glasgow District Tramways [Lords]—Reported [Preamble not proved]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 637

Railway Bill (Group 8)—Sir Lewis M'Iver reported from the Committee on Group 8 of Railway Bills, That, for the convenience of the Committee, they had adjourned till Tuesday next, at half-past Eleven of the clock. Report to lie upon the Table 637

Dublin Corporation Bill and Clontarf Urban District Council Bill (Joint Committee)—Dublin Corporation Bill and Clontarf Urban District Council Bill reported, with Amendments. Leave to the Committee to make a Special Report. Special Report brought up, and read. Reports and Special Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 637

Message from the Lords—That they have agreed to—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 13) Bill; Local Government Provisional Order (Housing of Working Classes) Bill; London (Clerkenwell and Holborn) Provisional Order Bill; London (Poplar) Provisional Order Bill, without amendment.

That they have agreed to—South-Eastern Metropolitan Tramways Bill, with an Amendment.

July 20.] *Page*

That they have agreed to—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 1 Bill; Pier and Harbours Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill; Great Northern Railway Bill; Midland Railway Bill; Portland Urban District Gas Bill, with amendments.

That they have agreed to Amendment to Amendments to—Hamilton, Motherwell, and Wishaw Tramways Bill.

That they had agreed to Amendments to—South Staffordshire Tramways Bill [Lords]; Aston Manor Tramways Bill [Lords]; Falkirk and District Water Bill [Lords], without amendment.

That they have agreed to—Burnley Corporation Bill [Lords], with an amendment.

That they have passed a Bill intituled, "An Act for empowering the Midland Great Western Railway of Ireland Company to acquire additional lands; to raise additional capital; and for other purposes." Midland Great Western Railway of Ireland Bill [Lords] 638

Midland Great Western Railway of Ireland Bill [Lords]—Read the first time; and referred to the Examiner of Petitions for Private Bills ... 638

PETITIONS.

East India (Contagious Diseases)—Petition for alteration of law, from Hoshangabad; Ferozepore; Calcutta; Bundi; Shimoga; Neemuch; Sandoway; Ludhiana (two); Nagpur; Hsipaw; Bhaisdehi; Aijal; Jalua (two; Ahmedabad; Batala; Girgoon; Bengal; Santipor; Bankupur; Belgaum; and Muttra; to lie upon the Table 638

Education (Scotland) Bill—Petition from Dundee, against; to lie upon the Table 639

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children (No. 2) Bill—Two Petitions from Leicester, in favour; to lie upon the Table 639

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children (Scotland) Bill—Petitions in favour, from Old Kilpatrick; and Loudoun; to lie upon the Table ... 639

Sunday Closing (Monmouthshire) Bill—Petitions in favour, from Belgrave Gate; Denby Dale; and Leicester (two); to lie upon the Table 639

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Civil Service Commission—Copy presented, of Forty-fourth Report of the Commissioners, with Appendix [by Command]; to lie upon the Table ... 639

Light Railways Act, 1896—Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of a Light Railway in the counties of Devon and Cornwall from Bere Alston Station to Calstock, and the working of a portion of the East Cornwall Mineral Railway as a Light Railway (Bere Alston and Calstock Light Railway Order, 1900) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 639

Technical Instruction Committees (Women Members—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 5th April; *Mr. Jebb*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 289] 639

Technical Instruction Act, 1889—Copy presented, of Minute sanctioning the subjects to be taught under Clause 8 of the Act for the county of Middlesex (Fifth Minute) [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 639

July 20.] *Page*

AGRARIAN OUTRAGES (IRELAND)—Copy presented, of Return for the quarter ended 30 June, 1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 640

PUBLIC RECORDS (IRELAND)—Copy presented, of Thirty-second Report of the Deputy Keeper of the Public Records and Keeper of the State Papers in Ireland [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 640

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES)—Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 2479 to 2483 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 640

ARMY (SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1900–1901) — Estimate presented, of the Further Amount which will be required in the year ending 31st March, 1901, to meet the Additional Expenditure, mainly due to the War in South Africa, Affairs in China, and for increased reserves of Stores [by Command]; Referred to the Committee of Supply, and to be printed. [No. 290] 640

ARMY (ORDNANCE FACTORIES) (ESTIMATE, 1900–1901)—Copy presented, of Revised Estimate of Charge for the year 1900–1901 [by Command]; Referred to the Committee of Supply, and to be printed. [No. 291] ... 640

QUESTIONS.

CHINA — ANTI-FOREIGN OUTBREAK — INCREASE OF BRITISH FORCES—Question, Mr. Joseph Walton (Yorkshire W.R., Barnsley); Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) 640

PROHIBITION OF EXPORTATION OF ARMS—Question, Mr. Dillon (Mayo, E.); Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 641

CONSUL-GENERAL WARREN—Question, Mr. Yerburgh (Chester); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 641

YANG-TSZE VALLEY—BRITISH PRECAUTIONS—Questions, Mr. Yerburgh and Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answer, Mr. Brodrick... 642

REPORTED MASSACRE OF MISSIONARIES IN SHAN-SI—Question, Mr. John Wilson (Falkirk Burghs); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 642

BRITISH NAVAL FORCE ON THE YANG-TSZE RIVER—Question, Mr. Joseph Walton; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 643

BRITISH TROOPS IN INDIA—Question, Mr. Herbert Roberts (Denbighshire, W.): Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Lord G. Hamilton, Middlesex, Ealing)... 643

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—ARMY MEDICAL DEPARTMENT—SUPPOSED PLEDGE OF SECRECY IMPOSED ON CIVIL SURGEONS—Questions, Dr. Farquharson (Aberdeenshire, W.), Mr. Burdett Coutts (Westminster), and Sir Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs); Answers, The Under Secretary of State for War (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 643

BATTLE OF THE TUGELA — COL. LONG AND SIR REDVERS BULLER—DESPATCHES—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 645

SOUTH AFRICAN BLUE BOOK—Question, Capt. Donelan (Cork, E.); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. J. Chamberlain, Birmingham, W.)... 645

July 20.] *Page*

Boer Treatment of Prisoners at Pretoria—Question, Mr. Lloyd-George (Carnarvon Boroughs); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 646

Reinforcements — Statistics — Questions, Mr. Lloyd-George and Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answers, Mr. Wyndham 646

Boer Women sent back to Enemies' Lines—Question, Mr. C. P. Scott, Lancashire, Leigh); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 646

Reserve Medical Officers—Promotion Regulation—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 647

Camden Fort (Cork) Gun Fatality—Question, Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 647

2nd Kent Artillery Volunteers—Easter Camp Allowances—Question, Sir Francis Evans (Southampton); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 648

Rifle Clubs—Government Allowances—Question, Mr. Goddard (Ipswich); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 648

South Denes (Yarmouth) Camp—Sisters of Nazareth—Question, Dr. Tanner; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 648

Volunteer Engineer Corps for South East Lancashire—Question, Sir J. W. Maclure (Lancashire, Stretford); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 649

Senior Naval Lord of the Admiralty—Official Residence—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Goschen, St. George's, Hanover Square) 649

Naval Emergency Coal Contracts—Question, Mr. D. A. Thomas (Merthyr Tydvil; Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Macartney, Antrim, N.) 650

British Central Africa—Chiromo and Lake Nyassa Railway—Question, Sir Brampton Gurdon (Norfolk, N.); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 651

Mauritius—British Central African Rifles—Question, Sir Brampton Gurdon; Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain 651

Australian Commonwealth—Governor-General's Residence—Question, Mr. Hogan (Tipperary, Mid); Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain ... 651

Indian Famine—Cholera Deaths—Question, Mr. C. P. Scott; Answer, Lord G. Hamilton 652

Famine Camps—Medical Staff—Question, Mr. C. P. Scott; Answer, Lord G. Hamilton 652

Railway Passengers' Luggage—Question, Mr. Trevelyan (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland); Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Ritchie, Croydon) 653

Water Gas Regulations—Questions, Mr. J. W. Wilson (Worcestershire, N.) and Mr. T. M. Healy (Louth, N.); Answer, Mr. Ritchie 653

British and American Coal Exports—Question, Mr. D. A. Thomas; Answer, Mr. Ritchie 654

July 20.] *Page*

FIRE BRIGADES COMMITTEE—PREMATURE PUBLICATION OF REPORT—Question, Sir George Fardell (Paddington, S.); Answer, The Under Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Jesse Collings, Birmingham, Bordesley) 654

YORK POSTAL STAFF—ASSISTANT INSPECTOR OF POSTMEN—Question, Mr. Steadman (Tower Hamlets, Stepney); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Hanbury, Preston) 655

LIVERPOOL POST OFFICE—PROMOTIONS—Question, Mr. Steadman; Answer, Mr. Hanbury 655

CENTRAL TELEGRAPH OFFICE—DINNER INTERVALS—Question, Mr. Steadman; Answer, Mr. Hanbury... 656

HARWICH POST OFFICE STAFF—Question, Mr. Goddard; Answer, Mr. Hanbury 657

NORTH DEVON NIGHT MAILS—Question, Sir Cameron Gull (Devonshire, Barnstaple); Answer, Mr. Hanbury 657

IMPERIAL GRANTS IN AID OF EDUCATION—Questions, Mr. Caldwell (Lanarkshire, Mid); Answers, The Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education (Sir J. Gorst, Camb. University) and The Lord Advocate (Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire)... 658

FEES IN SCOTTISH UNIVERSITIES—Question, Mr. Thomas Shaw (Hawick Burghs); Mr. A. Graham Murray 659

POSTAL DELIVERIES IN SOUTH WESTERN SCOTLAND—Question, Sir Mark Stewart (Kirkcudbrightshire); Answer, Mr. Hanbury 659

IRISH CENSUS RETURNS—Question, Mr. T. D. Sullivan (Donegal, W.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. G. W. Balfour, Leeds, Central) 660

MONAGHAN ASYLUM SEWERAGE SCHEME—Question, Mr. Daly (Monaghan, S.); Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour 660

MASTERSHIP OF THE BELFAST WORKHOUSE—Question, Mr. Daly; Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour 661

ARREARS IN IRISH SCHOOL GRANTS—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien (Kilkenny); Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour 662

SNEEM NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS—Question, Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N.); Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour 662

IRISH NATIONAL TEACHERS' CLASS SALARY—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien; Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour... 663

IRISH NATIONAL TEACHERS—NEW SCALE OF SALARIES, CLASSIFICATION, PROMOTIONS, ETC.—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien; Answer, G. W. Balfour... 663

IRISH INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION—ANNUAL REPORT—Question, Mr. Flynn; Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour 664

IRISH MONITORS' EXAMINATIONS—Question, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour 664

IRISH CONVICTS—MULDOWNEY AND FINIGAN—Questions, Mr. John Roche (Galway, E.), Mr. Dillon and Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answers, Mr. G. W. Balfour 664

IRISH MARKSMEN AT BISLEY—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien; Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour... 665

July 20.] *Page*

POLICE REGULATIONS AT QUEENSTOWN—Question, Mr. Hayden (Roscommon, S.); Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour 666

MAYO ASSIZES—CONTEMPT OF COURT—Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour... 666

CASTLEBAR POST OFFICE—Question, Dr. Robert Ambrose (Mayo, W.); Answer, Mr. Hanbury 667

CORNALARAGH POSTAL DELIVERIES—Question, Mr. Daly; Answer, Mr. Hanbury 668

GREAGHLONE LETTER BOX—Question, Mr. Daly; Answer, Mr. Hanbury ... 668

PHŒNIX PARK, DUBLIN—Ornamental Waters, Trees, etc.—Question, Mr. T. M. Healy; Answer, Mr. Hanbury 668

SNEEM PIER—Question, Mr. Flavin; Answer, The Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture for Ireland (Mr. Plunkett, Dublin co., S.) ... 669

IMPORT OF RUSSIAN EGGS—Questions, Mr. Field and Mr. Patrick O'Brien; Answers, Mr. Plunkett 670

AGRICULTURE—THE WARBLE FLY—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Plunkett 670

HAGUE CONFERENCE—RATIFICATION OF CONVENTION—Question, Mr. J. A. Pease (Northumberland, Tyneside); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 670

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—Questions, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs) and Mr. Buchanan (Aberdeenshire, E.); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour and Mr. J. Chamberlain — 671

PUBLIC BUSINESS.

Elementary Education Bill—Reported from the Standing Committee on Law, etc., without amendment, Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed [No. 292]. Minutes of Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed [No. 292.] Bill to be read the third time upon Monday next ... 672

BOILERS REGISTRATION AND INSPECTION—Report from the Select Committee, with Minutes of Evidence and an Appendix, brought up, and read. Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 294] 672

Borough Funds Bill—Order [this day] for Consideration, as amended (by the Standing Committee), read and discharged; Bill withdrawn 672

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS—That they have agreed to—Poor Removal Bill, Charitable Loans (Ireland) Bill, Veterinary Surgeons Amendment Bill, without amendment. That they have agreed to—Amendments to Land Charges Bill [Lords], without amendment. That they have passed a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Law relating to County Courts in Ireland." County Courts (Ireland) Bill [Lords]. Also a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Law relating to registration in Provincial and Diocesan Registries." Diocesan Registration Bill [Lords.] Also a Bill intituled, "An Act to relieve Members of County Councils and other Local Authorities from disqualification by reason of absence in certain cases." Members of Local Authorities Relief Bill [Lords] 672

NEW BILLS.

MEDICAL ACT (1858) EXTENSION—Bill to extend the provisions of the Medical Act, 1858, ordered to be brought in by General Laurie, Mr. Rothschild, Sir Mancherjee Bhownaggree, Colonel Wyndham Murray, Mr. Middlemore, and Sir James Fergusson.

July 20.] *Page*

Medical Act (1858) Extension Bill—"To extend the provisions of the Medical Act, 1858," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Wednesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 307.] ... 672

Railway and Canal Traffic Acts Amendment—Bill to amend the Railway and Canal Traffic Acts, 1854, 1873, and 1888, ordered to be brought in by Sir Thomas Gibson-Carmichael, Mr. Hedderwick, Mr. Arnold-Forster, Mr. Griffith-Boscawen, and Mr. Yoxall.

Railway and Canal Traffic Acts Amendment Bill—"To amend the Railway and Canal Traffic Acts, 1854, 1873, and 1888," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Friday next, and to be printed. [Bill 308.] 673

Teachers of Music Registration—Bill for the registration of Teachers of Music, ordered to be brought in by Mr. J. W. Sidebotham, Sir Henry Bemrose, Sir John Brunner, Mr. Alban Gibbs, Sir William Houldsworth, and Mr. Provand.

Teachers of Music Registration Bill—"For the registration of Teachers of Music," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday, 30th July, and to be printed. [Bill 309.] 673

SUPPLY [20th Allotted Day]—Considered in Committee. 673

(In the Committee.) 673

[Mr. J. W. Lowther (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.] 673

Civil Services and Revenue Department Estimates, 1900–1901. 673

Class IV. 673

1. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £787,503 (including a Supplementary sum of £95,434) be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Expenses of the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland, including a Grant in Aid of the Teachers' Pension Fund, Ireland." 673

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £787,403, be granted for the said Service."—(*Mr. O'Malley.*) 673

Discussion :— 673

Mr. John Redmond (Waterford) 682
Mr. Rentoul (Down, E.) ... 691
Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.) ... 700
The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. G. W. Balfour, Leeds, Central) 705
Mr. Harrington (Dublin, Harbour) 709
Mr. Herbert Lewis (Flint Boroughs) 712
Sir Thomas Esmonde (Kerry, W. 716
Mr. T. M. Healy (Louth, N.) 721
The Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture for Ireland (Mr. Plunkett, Dublin Co., S.) 728
Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.) 730
Major Jameson (Clare, W.) ... 732
Mr. T. D. Sullivan (Donegal, W.) 733
Mr. Daly (Monaghan, S.) ... 736
Mr. J. F. X. O'Brien (Cork) ... 738
Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick)... 738
Serjeant Hemphill (Tyrone, N.)... 742
Mr. Dillon (Mayo, E.) 746
Mr. T. P. O'Connor (Liverpool, Scotland) 755
Mr. Bitcher (York) 759
Mr. Crean (Queen's County, Ossory) 761
Dr. Tanner (Cork County, Mid)... 761
Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N. 763
Mr. Shee (Waterford, W.) ... 763

July 20.] *Page*

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 70; Noes, 104. (Division List No. 228.)

Original Question again proposed.

Mr. John Redmond ... 767 *The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.)* 768

Question put and agreed to.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do now report this Resolution to the House."—*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*

Mr. John Redmond ... 770 *Mr. T. M. Healy* 770

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

CLASS III.

2. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £54,767, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete a sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Expenses of Reformatory and Industrial Schools in Ireland."

DISCUSSION:—

Mr. Dillon ... ... 771 *Dr. Commins (Cork, S. E.)* ... 780
Mr G. W. Balfour ... 777 *Mr. Austin (Cork, S. E.)* ... 780
Sir. Thomas Esmonde ... 779

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum not exceeding £54,757, be granted for the said Service."—(*Mr. Dillon.*)

Original Question put, and agreed to.

Resolutions to be reported upon Monday next; Committee to sit again upon Monday next.

In pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th day of this instant July, Mr. Speaker adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at ten minutes before Two of the clock.

LORDS: MONDAY, 23RD JULY, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR aquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—Post Office Sites; Edinburgh (Housing of Working Class) Improvement Scheme Provisional Order.

Also the Certificate that no furthur Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bill:—Paisley Waterworks Provisional Order. The same were ordered to lie on the Table 785

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE—Report from, That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the following Bills ought to be dispensed with, and the Bills allowed to proceed:—London, Walthamstow, and Epping Forest Railway (Abandonment); North Metropolitan Electric Power Supply. Read, and agreed to 785

July 23.] *Page*

West Ham Corporation Bill — Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 785

West Bromwich Corporation Bill—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 785

Charing Cross and Strand Electricity Supply Bill—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 785

Croydon Tramways and Improvements Bill—Reported with Amendments 785

Scarborough Corporation Bill—The Queen's consent signified; and Bill reported, with Amendments 785

Lancaster Corporation Bill—The Queen's consent signified; and Bill reported, with Amendments 786

Durham (County of) Electric Power Supply Bill; Lancashire Electric Power Bill; Committed. The Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 786

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill—The Chairman of Committees informed the House that the opposition to the Order was withdrawn. The orders made on Monday and Thursday last discharged, and Bill committed to a Committee of the Whole House 786

Alexandra Park Bill—The Chairman of Committees informed the House that the opposition to the Bill was withdrawn. The orders made on Thursday last discharged, and Bill committed 786

Tramways Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill (Weston-super-Mare Order); Newcastle-upon-Tyne Electric Supply Bill; The Order made on Thursday last appointing certain Lords the Select Committee to consider the Bills, discharged 786

South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Bill—Moved, That the Order made on the 12th day of March last, "That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after Tuesday, the 26th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2ª; agreed to; Bill read 2ª accordingly 786

South Metropolitan Gas Bill; London and South Western Railway Bill; Aberdeen Corporation Tramways Bill; Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 786

Great Western Railway Bill—Read 3ª, with the Amendments; further Amendments made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons 786

London, Walthamstow, and Epping Forest Railway (Amendment) Bill—Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; and referred to the Examiners 787

Hammond (G. H.) Company Bill [H.L.]; London and San Francisco Bank Bill [H.L.]—Returned from the Commons agreed to 787

Belfast and County Down Railway Bill—Returned from the Commons with the Amendment agreed to 787

July 23.] *Page*

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill; Jarrow and Hebburn Electricity Supply Bill; Nottingham Corporation Bill—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 787

Edinburgh Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Mersey Railway Bill [H.L.]; Rawmarsh Urban District Council (Tramways) Bill [H.L.]—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to 787

Great Grimsby Street Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Margate Pier and Harbour Bill [H.L.]—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments ... 787

Newry, Keady, and Tynan Light Railway Bill—Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, the opposition thereto having been withdrawn; read, and ordered to lie on the Table: The orders made on the 13th instant and Monday last discharged; and Bill committed 787

Plymouth, Stonehouse, and Devonport Tramways Bill—Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, the opposition thereto having been withdrawn; read, and ordered to lie on the Table: The orders made on the 12th instant and Monday last discharged; and Bill committed for Thursday next ... 787

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9.) Bill—(Dorchester Order)—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 14) Bill—Torquay Order)—Tottenham Urban District Council Bill—Bray and Enniskerry Railway Bill—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Earl of Waldegrave and the Earl of Carnwath be proposed to the House as members of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Earl of Carrington and the Lord Heneage; read and agreed to... 788

London (St. Luke) Provisional Order Bill—London (Southwark) Provisional Order Bill—Read 3ª (according to Order), and passed 788

Tramways Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill—(Weston-super-Mare Order)—Newcastle-upon-Tyne Electric Supply Bill—Durham (County of) Electric Power Supply Bill—Lancashire Electric Power Bill—Shannon Water and Electric Power Bill—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the following Lords be proposed to the House to form the Select Committee for the consideration of the said Bills, viz.:—E. Carnwath, V. Frankfort de Montmorency, L. Wolverton, L. Aberdare, L. Brassey (Chairman.) Agreed to; and the said Lords appointed accordingly. The Committee to meet to-morrow at Eleven o'clock; and all petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Bills to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Bills ... 788

Shannon Water and Electric Power Bill—Moved, That the Order made on the 12th day of March last, "That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after Tuesday, the 26th day of June next," be dispensed with.—(*Lord Lurgan.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Lord Lurgan.*)

DISCUSSION:—

The Earl of Mayo 789
Lord Lurgan 790
Lord Massy 794
The Chairman of Committees (*The Earl of Morley*) 795

On Question, agreed to. Bill read 2ª accordingly, and committed; the Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

Page

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

UNIVERSITIES (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1889—General Report of the Commissioners under the Universities (Scotland) Act, 1889: with an appendix containing ordinances, minutes, correspondence, evidence and other documents 795

INDIA FAMINE—Advances and gifts to agriculturists for seed, cattle, and subsistence at the end of the famine... 795

RAILWAYS (CONTINUOUS BRAKES)—Return by the railway companies of the United Kingdom for the six months ending the 31st December, 1899. Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 795

CHINA—ANTI-FOREIGN OUTBREAK — PRESENTATION OF PAPERS—Question, The Earl of Kimberley; Answer, The Prime Minister and Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (The Marquess of Salisbury) 796

Education Bill [H.L.]—(Second Reading)—Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*The Duke of Devonshire.*)

DISCUSSION:—

Lord Norton 796
Earl Spencer 799
The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury 809
Lord Reay 812
The Lord Bishop of Hereford ... 818
The Earl of Kimberley 823
The Lord President of the Council (the Duke of Devonshire) ... 827

On Question, agreed to.

Bill read 2ª accordingly.

DISCUSSION:—

Lord Kinnaird 834
The Under Secretary of State for India (the Earl of Onslow) ... 835

Beer Retailers' and Spirit Grocers' Licences (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill—Amendments reported (according to Order). Further Amendments made; and Bill to be read 3ª. 837

Copyright Bill [H.L.]—Order of the day for the House to be put into Committee, read.

Lord Monkswell 840

House in Committee (according to Order). The Amendments proposed by the Select Committee made.

A further Amendment made; and Bill re-committed to the Standing Committee; and to be printed as amended. [No. 206.]

Tithe Rent-Charge (Ireland) Bill—House in Committee (according to Order).

Clauses 1 to 8 amended, and agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"In page 4, after Clause 8, to insert the following new clause: '9. Subsection 1 of Section 37 of the Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1896 (which dispenses with the consent of the Treasury to the redemption of tithe rent-charge as therein mentioned) shall not have effect in the case of any tithe rent-charge to which Section 3 of this Act applies.'"—(*Lord Ashbourne.*)

Amendment agreed to.

July 23.] *Page*

Remaining clauses amended, and agreed to.

Bill re-committed to the Standing Committee; and to be printed as amended. (No. 207.)

IRISH FISHERIES—INSPECTORS' REPORTS.

The Earl of Mayo ... ... 841 *The Earl of Denbigh* 842

Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill—House in Committee (according to Order); Amendments made; Bill re-committed to the Standing Committee; and to be printed as amended. (No. 208) 842

Prohibition of Exportation of Arms Bill [H.L.]—[SECOND READING]—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

The Lord Chancellor (*The Earl of Halsbury*) 842

Bill read 2ª (according to Order), and committed to a Committee of the whole House to-morrow.

SOUTH AFRICA—SETTLEMENT OF SOLDIERS IN THE ORANGE RIVER COLONY AFTER THE WAR—Question, Lord Wolverton; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for the Colonies (The Earl of Selborn) 843

House adjourned at a quarter past Eight of the clock.

COMMONS: MONDAY, 23RD JULY, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH)—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz.:—Sunderland Corporation Bill [Lords]. Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time . 844

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH)—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz.:—Tramway Orders Confirmation (No. 3) Bill [Lords]; Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 4) Bill [Lords]: Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time To-morrow 844

Hastings Tramways Bill; Lambeth Water Bill; Lancashire, Derbyshire, and East Coast Railway Bill — Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to 845

Bury and District Water (Transfer) Bill [Lords]—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 845

Barnsley Corporation Bill [Lords]; Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway Bill [Lords]—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 845

July 23.] *Page*

London, Walthamstow, and Epping Forest Railway (Abandonment) Bill—Not amended, considered.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed... 845

North British Railway Bill [Lords]—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 845

Preston Corporation Bill [Lords]—As amended, considered; Amendments made. Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed, with Amendments ... 845

Ramsgate Corporation Improvements Bill [Lords]; Rotherhithe and Ratcliff Tunnel Bill [Lords]; As amended, considered; to be read the third time 845

Bournemouth Corporation Bill [Lords] — Read a second time, and committed 845

Crystal Palace Company Bill [Lords]—Read a second time, and committed. Ordered, That Standing Orders 211 and 236 be suspended, and that the Committee on the Bill have leave to sit and proceed forthwith.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*) 845

Brompton and Piccadilly Circus Railway Bill—Order [12th February] referring the Brompton and Piccadilly Circus Railway Bill to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)... 846

Buenos Ayres and Rosario Railway Bill [Lords]—Ordered, That Standing Orders 211 and 236 be suspended, and that the Committee on the Buenos Ayres and Rosario Railway Bill [Lords] have leave to sit and proceed forthwith—(*Mr. Caldwell.*) 846

Costa Rica Railway Company Limited, Bill [Lords] — Ordered, That Standing Orders 211 and 236 be suspended, and that the Committee on the Costa Rica Railway Company, Limited, Bill [Lords] have leave to sit and proceed forthwith.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*) 846

Roe's Patent Bill [Lords]—Ordered, That Standing Orders 211 and 236 be suspended, and that the Committee on Roe's Patent Bill [Lords] have leave to sit and proceed forthwith.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*) 846

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill—Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill—Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to 846

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [Lords]—As amended, considered; to be read the third time To-morrow 846

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill [Lords]—Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Order confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill, as amended, to be considered To morrow... 846

July 23.] *Page*

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS -That they have agreed to—Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill; Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (Housing of Working Classes) Bill; Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (Housing of Working Classes) (No. 2) Bill, without amendment. That they have agreed to Amendments to—Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [Lords], Whitechapel and Bow Railway Bill [Lords], Exmouth Urban District Water Bill [Lords], Gwyrfai Rural District Council Water Bill [Lords], without amendment 846

PETITIONS.

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday Bill—Two Petitions from Ryton-on-Tyne, in favour; to lie upon the Table 847

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children (No. 2) Bill—Petitions in favour, from Swalwell; Dunston-on-Tyne (two); New Washington; and Usworth Colliery; to lie upon the Table 847

Sunday Closing (Monmouthshire) Bill—Petitions in favour, from Dunston-on-Tyne; Blaydon; Winlaton; Hedgefield; Crawcrook; Rowlands Gill; Blaydon Haughs; and Usworth Colliery; to lie upon the Table 847

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

RAILWAYS (CONTINUOUS BRAKES)—Copy presented, of Return by Railway Companies of the United Kingdom for the six months ending the 31st December, 1899 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 848

UNIVERSITIES (SCOTLAND) Act, 1889—Copy presented, of General Report of the Commissioners under the Universities (Scotland) Act, 1889, with an Appendix containing Ordinances, Minutes, Correspondence, Evidence, and other Documents [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 848

SHEBEENS IN TOWNS (IRELAND)—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 6th July; *Mr. Macaleese*]; to lie upon the Table 848

EAST INDIA (FAMINE)—Copy presented, of Advances and Gifts to Agriculturists for Seed, Cattle, and Subsistence at the End of the Famine [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 848

POST OFFICE TELEGRAPHS (REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE)—Return ordered, "of Revenue and Expenditure of the Post Office for each year from 1869-70 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 319, of Session 1899), and an Estimate for the same for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1900, in the following form:—

Year.	Revenue.				Expenditure.															
	Telegraph receipts.	Extra receipts.	Estimated value of services to other Departments.	Total.	Sites and Buildings.		Telegraph extension.	Superannuation and other non-effective charges.	Salaries, wages, &c.	Percentage of salaries, wages, &c., to total Revenue.	Maintenance of telegraph system.	Percentage of maintenance of telegraph system to total Revenue.	Other Expenditure.		Total Expenditure.	Percentage of total Expenditure to total Revenue.	Net Revenue.	Net Revenue after deducting Columns 5, 6, and 7.	Interest on stock created for purchase of telegraphs.
					Purchase.	Erection.							Under Telegraph Vote.	Under other Votes.					
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		10		11	12	13		14	15	16

—(*Mr. Hanbury*) 848

POST OFFICE (REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE)—Return ordered, "of Revenue and Expenditure of the Post Office for each year from 1869–70 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 320, of Session 1899), and an Estimate of the same for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1900, in the following form :—

Year.	Revenue.				Expenditure.											Total Expenditure.	Percentage of total Expenditure to total Revenue.	Net Revenue.	Net Revenue, after deducting Columns 5 and 6.
	Postal receipts.	Extra receipts.	Estimated value of services to other Departments.	Total.	Sites and Buildings.		Superannuations and other non-effective charges.	Salaries, wages, &c.	Percentage of salaries, &c., to total Revenue.	Conveyance of mails.	Percentage of conveyance of mails to total Revenue.	Packet service.	Other Expenditure.						
					Purchase.	Erection.							Under Post Office Vote.	Under other Votes.					
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		9		10	11	12	13		14	15	

—(*Mr. Hanbury*) 849

UNIVERSITIES (SCOTLAND)—Return ordered, "of the amount of Class Fees paid by Students attending each of the Universities of Scotland, showing for each University the various Faculties, the Class Subjects, the number of Students at the respective Classes, and the amount of Fees paid for instruction at these respective Classes, according to the following form :—

Name of University_____

Name of Faculty_____

Name of Class.	Students.						Class Fees.					
	Winter Session, 1899–1900.			Summer Session, 1900.			Winter Session, 1899–1900.			Summer Session, 1900.		
	Men.	Women.	Total.	Men.	Women.	Total.	Men.	Women.	Total.	Men.	Women.	Total.
							£	£	£	£	£	£

with Summaries showing the total number of students and amounts of fees respectively in each Falculty and each University; and also grand totals for Scottish Universities."—(*Mr. Thomas Shaw*) 849

QUESTIONS.

CHINA—ANTI-FOREIGN OUTBREAK—POSITION IN PEKING—RECENT NEWS—Question, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs); Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) 849

THE YANG-TSZE VICEROYS—Question, Mr. Yerburgh (Chester); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 851

July 23.] *Page*

CHINESE REPRESENTATIVES IN THIS COUNTRY—Question, Mr. Hedderwick (Wicks Burghs); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 852

EXPORTS OF MUNITIONS OF WAR TO CHINA—Question, Col. Pilkington (Lancashire, Newton); Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for War (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 853

PEKING LEGATION—NAVAL GUARD—Question, Sir John Colomb (Great Yarmouth); Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Goschen, St. George's, Hanover Square) 853

PROVISION FOR THE SICK AND WOUNDED IN CHINA—HOSPITAL SHIP PRESENTED BY MAHARAJAH OF GWALIOR—Question, Mr. Hedderwick; Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Lord G. Hamilton, Middlesex, Ealing)... 853

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL ARRANGEMENTS—COMMISSION OF INQUIRY—Questions, Col. Wyndham Murray (Bath) and Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.); Answers, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 854

PUBLICATION OF DESPATCHES—Question, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 855

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES—Question, Capt. Donelan (Cork, E.); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 856

TRANSPORT OFFICERS—REWARDS AND DISTINCTIONS—Question, Mr. Lambert (Devon, South Molton); Answer, Mr. Goschen 857

BOER PRISONERS FOR CEYLON—Question, Capt. Sinclair (Forfarshire); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 857

RECENT MILITARY OPERATIONS—Question, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 857

HOSPITAL RETURNS—Question, Mr. Maddison (Sheffield, Brightside); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 858

BOER WOMEN SENT TO THE ENEMY'S LINES—Question, Mr. C. P. Scott (Lancashire, Leigh); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 858

3RD INNISKILLING FUSILIERS—Question, Mr. Macaleese (Monaghan, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 858

MILITARY LANDS ACT, 1892—Question, Capt. Sinclair; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 859

WAR OFFICE EMPLOYEES' BONUS—Question, Capt. Norton (Newington, W.); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the War Office (Mr. J. Powell Williams, Birmingham, S.) 859

LANCASHIRE VOLUNTEER ALLOWANCES—Question, Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 860

KILWORTH RIFLE RANGE—Question, Mr. Maurice Healy (Cork); Answer, Mr. J. Powell Williams 860

ARMY SHIRT CONTRACTS—Questions, Mr. Maurice Healy and Mr. T. M. Healy (Louth, N.); Answers, Mr. Powell Williams 861

July 23.] *Page*

THE CHANNEL FLEET — VISIT TO INVERGORDON—Question, Mr. Caldwell Lanarkshire, Mid); Answer, Mr. Goschen 862

SAILING TRAINING SQUADRON—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answer, Mr. Goschen 862

FOREIGN MEN-OF-WAR IN JERSEY HARBOUR—Questions, Mr. Lambert and Mr. Arnold-Forster (Belfast, W.); Answers, Mr. Goschen... 863

ROYAL MARINE OFFICERS' CLOTHING—Question, Mr. Arnold-Forster; Answer, Mr. Goschen 863

INDIAN FAMINE—RELIEF STATISTICS—Question, Mr. C. P. Scott; Answer, Lord G. Hamilton 864

ADVANCES TO CULTIVATORS FOR SEED AND CATTLE—Question, Mr. C. P. Scott; Answer, Lord G. Hamilton 864

LOANS TO NATIVE STATES—Question, Mr. C. P. Scott; Answer, Lord G. Hamilton 865

INDIAN RAILWAYS — FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS — Question, Mr. Gordon (Elgin and Nairn); Answer, Lord G. Hamilton 865

STATE-AIDED RAILWAYS—DETERMINATION OF CONTRACTS—Question, Mr. Gordon; Answer, Lord G. Hamilton 867

NIGER COAST PROTECTORATE—SPIRIT IMPORTS—Question, Mr. Lawrence (Liverpool, Abercromby); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. J. Chamberlain, Birmingham, W.) 867

IMPERIAL TELEGRAPHIC COMMUNICATION—DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE—Questions, Sir Edward Sassoon (Hythe) and Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answers, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Hanbury, Preston) ... 867

SCHOOL ATTENDANCE AUTHORITIES—BYE-LAWS IN AGRICULTURAL DISTRICTS —Question Mr. Jeffreys (Hampshire, N.); The Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education (Sir J. Gorst, Cambridge University) 868

CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION—Question, Mr. Mather (Lancashire, Rossendale); Answer, Sir J. Gorst 869

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY MAPS—Question, Mr. Hazell (Leicester); Answer, Sir J. Gorst 869

LONDON SCHOOL BOARD AUDIT CASE—Question, Mr. Evelyn Cecil (Hertfordshire, Hertford); Answer, Sir J. Gorst 870

RECENT POSTAL DELAYS—Questions, Sir George Fardell (Paddington, S.) and Mr. Bartley (Islington, N.); Answers, Mr. Hanbury 870

EXCESS POSTAGE—Question, Mr. Duckworth (Lancashire, Middleton); Answer, Mr. Hanbury 871

INCOME TAX DEDUCTIONS—Question, Mr. Hazell; Answer, Mr. Hanbury ... 872

SEIZURES OF FOREIGN PRISON-MADE GOODS—Question, Mr. Lambert; Answer, Mr. Hanbury 872

DISTRICT MESSENGERS COMPANY—Question, Col. Milward (Warwickshire, Stratford-upon-Avon); Answer, Mr. Hanbury 873

July 23.] *Page*

WATER FOR CATTLE ON RAILWAYS—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien (Kilkenny); Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Ritchie, Croydon) 873

THIRD CLASS SEASON TICKETS—Question, Mr. Stephens (Middlesex, Hornsey); Answer, Mr. Ritchie 873

CONVICT WARDERS AND THE RESERVE—PORTLAND ESTABLISHMENT—Question, Mr. J. A. Pease, Northumberland, Tyneside); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir M. White Ridley, Lancashire, Blackpool) 874

CONVICT WARDERS' PENSIONS—Question Mr. J. A. Pease; Answer, Sir M. White Ridley 875

SHEFFIELD LAUNDRY BARRACKS—Question, Mr. Tennant (Berwickshire); Answer, Sir M. White Ridley 875

BAIL REGULATIONS—Question, Mr. Hazell; Answer, The Attorney-General (Sir Robert Findlay, Inverness Burghs) 875

ROAD CONSTRUCTION IN THE ISLE OF LEWIS — Question, Mr. Caldwell (Lanarkshire, Mid); Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire) 876

INVER WATER SUPPLY—Question, Mr. Caldwell; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 877

CRIME IN COUNTY MONAGHAN—Question, Mr. Daly (Monaghan, S.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. G. W. Balfour, Leeds, Central) ... 877

IRISH POLICE BATONS AND HANDCUFFS—Question, Mr. T. M. Healy; Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour 878

COUNTY COURTS (IRELAND) BILL—Question, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour 878

IRISH LOCAL GOVERNMENT RETURNS — Question, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour 878

IRISH TEACHERS AND RESULT FEES—Question, Mr. M'Dermott (Kilkenny, N.); Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour 879

PUBLIC HOUSE LICENCES IN IRELAND—Question, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour 879

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—HOUSE RENT ALLOWANCES—Question, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour 880

KILTEEVAN DRUM AND FIFE BAND—Question, Mr. Hayden (Roscommon, S.); Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour 880

SUTTON TO HOWTH TRAMWAY—Question, Mr. T. M. Healy; Answer, Mr. Ritchie 881

SLIGO AND NORTHERN COUNTIES RAILWAY—MIXED TRAINS—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. Ritchie 882

TRUCK ACT PROSECUTIONS AT DUNGLOE SESSIONS—Question, Mr. T. D. Sullivan (Donegal, W.); Answer, The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.) 882

July 23.] *Page*

UNSUCCESSFUL APPLICATION AGAINST THE DONEGAL JUSTICES—Question, Mr. T. D. Sullivan; Answer, Mr. Atkinson... 883

CORK ASSIZES—SELECTION OF JURYMEN—Questions, Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.) and Capt. Donelan; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 884

DRIFT NET FISHING AT ARKLOW—Question, Mr. James O'Connor (Wicklow, W.); Answer, The Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture for Ireland (Mr. Plunkett, Dublin County, S.) 885

PROTECTION OF IRISH FISHERIES—Question, Mr. Power (Waterford, E.); Answer; Mr. Plunkett 885

LIGHTHOUSE AUTHORITY AT CAHIRCIVEEN—Question, Capt. Donelan; Answer, Mr. Plunkett 886

EQUALISATION OF DUBLIN RATES—Question, Mr. T. M. Healy; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 886

ROYAL COMMISSION ON LOCAL TAXATION—Question, Mr. Lambert; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 887

CONTEMPT OF COURT—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour... 887

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE — Questions, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Courtney (Cornwall, Bodmin) and Mr. Channing (Northamptonshire, E.); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 887

PUBLIC BUSINESS.

Highways and Bridges Act (1891) Amendment Bill—Order for Committee read, and discharged; Bill withdrawn 888

Liquor Traffic Local Veto (Scotland) Bill—Order for resuming adjourned debate on Amendment to Second Reading [2nd May] upon Wednesday, 25th July, read, and discharged; Bill withdrawn 888

County Courts (Ireland) Bill [Lords]—Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Thursday, and to be printed. [Bill 310].

NEW MEMBER SWORN—James Archibald Morrison, Esquire, for the County of Wiltshire (Southern or Wilton Division).

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill—On the introduction of this Bill.
Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.) 889

Bill to continue various expiring Laws, ordered to be brought in by Mr Hanbury and Mr. Attorney-General.

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill—"To continue various expiring Laws," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 311] 889

Military Lands Bill—[SECOND READING]—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Wyndham.*)

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Question proposed "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

July 23.] *Page*

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. Herbert Lewis (*Flint Boroughs*) 907
Mr. Monk (*Gloucester*) ... 909
Mr. Maurice Healy (*Cork*) ... 910
Sir Howard Vincent (*Sheffield, Central*) 914
Mr. Channing (*Northamptonshire, E.*) 915
Col. Pilkington (*Lancashire, Newton*) 916
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (*Stirling Burghs*) 917
Mr. T. M. Healy (*Louth, N.*) ... 920
Mr. Jasper More (*Shropshire, Ludlow*) 922
Sir James Joicey (*Durham, Chester-le-Street*) 923

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 186 ; Noes, 47. (Division List No. 230.)

Main Question put, and agreed to. Bill read a second time, and committed for To-morrow.

Volunteers Bill [Lords]—Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER, Cumberland, Penrith, in the Chair.]

Clause 1 :—

Captain Sinclair (*Forfarshire*) 925

Question proposed, "That Clause 1 stand part of the Bill."

DISCUSSION :—

Sir Howard Vincent (*Sheffield, Central*) 929
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (*Stirling Burghs*) ... 931
The Under-Secretary of State for War (*Mr. Wyndham, Dover*) ... 934
Mr. Radcliffe Cooke (*Hereford*) 935
Mr. C. P. Scott (*Lancashire, Leigh*) 936
Mr. Wylie (*Dumbartonshire*) ... 938
Mr. Maddison (*Sheffield, Brightside*) 939
Colonel Pilkington (*Lancashire, Newton*) 941
Mr. Cawley (*Lancs., Prestwich*) ... 944
Mr. John Wilson (*Falkirk Burghs*) 945
Mr. John Burns (*Battersea*) ... 945
Capt. Sinclair 949

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 127 ; Noes 62. (Division List No. 231.)

Clause 2 :—

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 10, after 'Volunteer,' to insert 'garrison artillery.'"—(*Captain Sinclair.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'garrison artillery' be there inserted."

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. John Burns 953
Mr. Wyndham 953
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 954
Sir John Brunner (*Cheshire, Northwich*) 955
Major Jameson (*Clare, W.*) 957
Col. Sandys (*Lancs., Bootle*) 957
Mr. Wyndham 958
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman ... 958
Mr. Buchanan (*Aberdeenshire, E.*) 958
Col. Blundell (*Lancs., Ince*) ... 958
Mr. Humphreys-Owen (*Montgomeryshire*) ... ...

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 10, to leave out from second 'to' to end of line 14, and insert 'the liability to be called out for actual military service at any time at such places in Great Britain as may be specified in his agreement.'"—(*Mr. Wyndham.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, lines 17 and 18, to leave out 'and eighteen,' and insert 'to twenty.'"

Amendment agreed to.

Consequential Amendment made.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 19, at the end, to add the words, 'Provided always that regulations made under this section shall not come into effect until they have lain four weeks upon the Table of each House of Parliament whilst that House is sitting.'"—(*Mr. Buchanan.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. Wyndham ... ... 961 *Capt. Sinclair* 962

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 60; Noes, 143. (Division List No. 232.)

Question proposed, "That Clause 2, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

Capt. Sinclair ... ... 963 *Mr. John Burns*... 964

Question put and agreed to.

Clauses 3 and 4 agreed to.

On the question that the Bill, as amended, be reported.

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. John Burns ... ... 965 *Mr. Wyndham* 965

Bill reported, with Amendments; as amended, to be considered To-morrow.

Reserve Forces Bill [Lords]—Considered in Committee. (In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER, Cumberland, Penrith, in the Chair.]

Clause 1 :—

Question proposed, "That Clause 1 stand part of the Bill."

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. Buchanan ... ... 965 *Mr. Wyndham* 966

Question put and agreed to.

Clause 2 :—

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 7, after 'and,' to add '(*d*) if under the foregoing provisions the rank of any such man in the Militia is raised or reduced above or below that which he held before he entered on permanent service his pay shall be correspondingly raised or reduced.'"—(*Mr. Wyndham.*)

Amendment agreed to.

July 23.] *Page*

Remaining clauses agreed to.

Bill reported, with the Amendment; as amended, to be considered To-morrow.

Naval Reserve Bill—[Second Reading]—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Goschen.*)

Discussion:—

Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 967
Mr. John Burns 968
Mr. Goschen 969
Commander Bethell 969

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed for Thursday.

Colonial Stock Bill [Lords]—[Second Reading]—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Discussion:—

Mr. Haldane (Haddingtonshire) 971
Mr. Cohen (Islington, E.) ... 971
Mr. Caldwell 972
Mr. Sydney Buxton (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) ... 974
Sir James Joicey (Durham, Chester-le-Street) 974
Mr. Banbury (Camberwell, Peckham) 975

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed for To-morrow.

Imitation of County Court Process Bill [Lords]—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Discussion:—

Mr. Caldwell 975
The Attorney-General (Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs) 976
Mr. T. M. Healy 977

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 113; Noes, 11. (Division List No. 233.)

Bill read a second time, and committed for To-morrow.

Public Works Loan Bill—Considered in Committee,

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. Lowther (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 1:—

Amendment proposed—

"In Clause 1, page 1, line 13, to leave out 'Edward Howley Palme Esquire.'"—(*Mr. Hanbury.*)

Amendment agreed to.

July 23.] *Page*

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, to leave out 'Lord Iveagh.'"—(*Mr. Hanbury.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, after line 2, to insert 'The Honourable James Henry Cecil Hozier, M.P.'"—(*Mr. Hanbury.*)

Dr. Tanner (Cork co., Mid) 979

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 2, after the last-mentioned name to insert 'David Lloyd-George, Esq., M.P.'"

Amendment agreed to.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 2:—

Mr. Herbert Lewis... ... 980 *Mr. Hanbury* 980

Clause agreed to.

Clause 3:—

Mr. T. M. Healy ... ... 980 *Mr. Jonathan Samuel (Stockton)* 982
Mr. Hanbury ... ... 980 *Dr. Tanner* 983
Mr. Caldwell 980

Clause agreed to.

Bill reported, as amended, to be considered To-morrow.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

On the Motion for Adjournment:—

Mr. A. J. Balfour 984

Adjourned at a quarter after One of the clock.

LORDS: TUESDAY, 24TH JULY, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Shannon Water and Electric Power Bill—Witnesses ordered to attend the Select Committee, two to produce Documents 985

South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Bill—Committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection... 985

Great Grimsby Street Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Margate Pier and Harbour Bill [H.L.]—Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to 985

Farnworth Urban District Council Bill; Rickmansworth and Uxbridge Valley Water Bill; Newry, Keady, and Tynan Light Railway Bill—Reported, with Amendments... 985

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 14) Bill—Reported from the Select Committee without amendment, and committed to a Committee of the whole House on Thursday next 985

July 24.] *Page*

St. David's Railway (Additional Powers) Bill—The CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES informed the House, That the promoters do not intend to proceed further with the Bill. Ordered that the Bill be not further proceeded with 985

London County Tramways (No. 2) Bill—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 985

North Metropolitan Electric Power Supply Bill—Moved, That the Order made on the 12th day of March last, "That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after Tuesday the 26th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2ª; agreed to. Bill read 2ª accordingly, and committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 985

Great Indian Peninsula Railway Company Bill—Read 3ª, and passed ... 986

London County Council (Money) Bill—Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 986

Ifracombe Improvement Bill—Read 3ª, with Amendments; further Amendments made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons 986

London and South Western Railway (Wales) Bill; East London Water Bill; London and North Western Railway Bill; Blackpool, St. Anne's and Lythan Tramways Bill; Read 3ª, with the Amendments; and passed, and returned to the Commons 986

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill; Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill; Great Northern Railway Bill; Hastings Tramways Bill; Lambeth Water Bill; Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 986

Lancashire, Derbyshire, and East Coast Railway Bill; Midland Railway Bill; Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 986

Bury and District Water (Transfer) Bill [H.L.]; Preston Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments; the said Amendments considered, and agreed to 986

South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Bill; North Metropolitan Electric Power Supply Bill—Report from the Committee of Selection that the five Lords appointed a Select Committee on the Durham (County of) Electric Power Supply, and other Bills, do form the Select Committee for the consideration of the South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Bill and the North Metropolitan Electric Power Supply Bill; read, and agreed to; all petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Bills to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Bills 987

Durham (County of) Electric Power Supply Bill; Lancashire Electric Power Bill; Shannon Water and Electric Power Bill; South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Bill; North Metropolitan Electric Power Supply Bill—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Duke of Argyll be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Lord Brassey, and that the Duke of Argyll be Chairman of the said Committee; read, and agreed to 987

July 24.] *Page*

Local (St. Marylebone) Provisional Order Bill—Moved, That the Order made on the 12th day of March last, "That no Provisional Order Conformation Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after Tuesday, the 26th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2ª; agreed to. Bill read 2ª accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the whole House 987

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill—House in Committee (according to Order). Amendments made; Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received on Thursday next... 987

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

ARMY — Statement of Stores transferred from Navy to land service for South Africa up to 31st December, 1899 988

QUEEN'S COLLEGE, BELFAST—Report of the President for the year 1899–1900 988

TREATY SERIES, No. 15 (1900)—Convention between the United Kingdom and Uruguay renewing the treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation of 13th November, 1885; signed at Monte Video 15th July, 1899 (ratifications exchanged at Monte Video 9th June, 1900) 988

TRADE REPORTS—Annual Series: No. 2484. Trade of Frankfort-on-Main for the year 1899. Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table ... 988

POLICE ACT, 1890 –Correspondence relative to the refusal of the Secretary of State's certificate, under Section 17 (2) of the Act, to the River Tyne Police Force for the year ended 29th September, 1899. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 988

County and Borough Franchise Assimilation (London) Bill — Reported from the Standing Committee without Amendment, and to be read 3ª on Thursday next... 988

Town Councils (Scotland) Bill — Reported from the Standing Committee with further Amendments; the Report of the Amendments made in Committee of the whole House and by the Standing Committee to be received on Thursday next, and Bill to be printed as amended. (No. 209) 988

Tithe Rent-Charge (Ireland) Bill—Reported from the Standing Committee without further amendment; the Report of the Amendments made in Committee of the whole House to be received on Thursday next... ... 988

Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill—Reported from the Standing Committee without further Amendment; the Report of the Amendments made in Committee of the whole House to be received on Thursday next 989

Cruelty to Wild Animals in Captivity Bill—Amendments reported (according to Order), and Bill to be read 3ª on Thursday next 989

Agricultural Holdings Bill—[SECOND READING]—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*The Lord Privy Seal.*)

DISCUSSION:—
Lord Burghclere ... ... 996 *Lord de Ramsey*... 1008
The Earl of Camperdown ... 1001

On Question, agreed to. Bill read 2ª accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the whole House on Friday next.

July 24.] *Page*

Lunacy Board (Scotland) (Salaries, etc.) Bill—[SECOND READING]—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

The Secretary for Scotland (*Lord Balfour of Burleigh*) 1010

Bill read 2ª (according to Order), and Committed to a Committee of the whole House on Thursday next.

Inebriates Amendment (Scotland) Bill [H.L.] -Commons Amendment considered (according to Order), and agreed to 1010

Executors (Scotland) Bill—House in Committee (according to Order); an Amendment made; Bill re-committed to the Standing Committee; and to be printed as amended. (No. 194) 1010

Beer Retailers' and Spirit Grocers' Licences (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill—Read 3ª (according to Order), with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 1010

Prohibition of Exportation of Arms Bill [H.L.] -House in Committee (according to Order); Bill reported without Amendment; Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3ª on Thursday next 1010

House of Lords Offices -Second Report from the Select Committee considered.

DISCUSSION :—

Lord Tweedmouth 1011
The Lord President of the Council (*The Duke of Devonshire*) 1014
The Earl of Kimberley 1016
The Earl of Morley 1019
The Lord Chancellor (*The Earl of Halsbury*) 1022

On Question, Report agreed to.

EDUCATIONAL GRANTS—DIFFERENTIAL TREATMENT IN RURAL AND URBAN SCHOOLS.

DISCUSSION :—

Lord Heneage 1024
The Lord Bishop of Manchester 1028
The Lord Bishop of Hereford ... 1030
The Duke of Devonshire 1034

Motion, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

Inebriates Amendment (Scotland) Bill [H.L.]—Order of Friday last, for printing of Commons Amendment, discharged 1037

House adjourned at five minutes past Seven of the clock.

COMMONS: TUESDAY, 24TH JULY, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [Lords] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH)—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz.: — Midland Great Western Railway of Ireland Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time 1037

July 24.] *Page*

STANDING COMMITTEE ON LAW, ETC.—Ordered, That the Standing Committee on Law, etc., have leave to sit this day during the Sitting of the House.—(*Mr. T. W. Russell*) 1037

Burnley Corporation Bill [Lords] – Lords Amendment to Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to 1037

Great Northern Railway Bill; Midland Railway Bill—Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to 1037

Rotherham Corporation Bill [Lords] –Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 1038

Glasgow Building Regulations Bill [Lords]—As amended, considered; Amendments made.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*) Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 1038

South Shields Corporation Bill [Lords]—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 1038

Motherwell and Bellshill Railway Bill [Lords] (BY ORDER)—As amended, considered.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*) Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 1038

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [Lords] –Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 1038

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill [Lords]—As amended, considered; to be read the third time To-morrow 1038

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 3) Bill [Lords]—Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 4) Bill [Lords]—Read a second time, and committed 1038

Crystal Palace Company Bill [Lords] –Reported, without Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill to be read the third time 1038

Roe's Patent Bill [Lords]—Reported, without Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill to be read the third time 1038

Salford Corporation Bill [Lords]—Withington Urban District Council Bill [Lords]; South Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railways Bill [Lords]; Ipswich Corporation Tramways Bill [Lords]; Buenos Ayres and Rosario Railway Bill [Lords]—Reported with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 1039

Costa Rica Railway Company Bill [Lords]—Reported, without Amendment; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 1039

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS—That they have agreed to—London (St. Luke) Provisional Order Bill, London (Southwark) Provisional Order Bill, without Amendment.

That they have agreed to—South Metropolitan Gas Bill, London and South Western Railway Bill, Aberdeen Corporation Tramways Bill, Great Western Railway Bill, with Amendments.

That they have agreed to Amendments to –Edinburgh Corporation Bill [Lords], Mersey Railway Bill [Lords], Rawmarsh Urban District Council (Tramways) Bill [Lords], without Amendment 1039

PETITIONS.

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children (No. 2) Bill—Petitions in favour, from Truro and East Bristol; to lie upon the Table 1039

Sunday Closing (Monmouthshire) Bill—Petitions in favour, from Hastings and Battle; to lie upon the Table 1039

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Shebeens in Towns (Ireland)—Return [presented 23rd July] to be printed. [No. 295] 1039

Police Act, 1890—Copy presented, of correspondence relative to the refusal of the Secretary of State's Certificate under Section 17 (2) of the Act to the River Tyne Police Force, for the year ended 29th September, 1899 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 1040

Queen's College (Belfast)—Copy presented, of Annual Report of the President for the Session 1899–1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1040

Army—Copy presented, of Statement of Stores transferred from Navy to Land Service for South Africa up to 31st December, 1899 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1040

Contracts for Local Authorities (Wages)—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 9th April; *Sir Charles Dilke*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 296] 1040

Trade Reports (Annual Series)—Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No. 2484 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1040

Treaty Series (No. 15, 1900)—Copy presented, of Convention between the United Kingdom and Uruguay, renewing the Treaty of Friendship, Commerce, and Navigation of 13th November, 1885. Signed at Monte Video, 15th July, 1899. Ratifications exchanged at Monte Video, 9th June, 1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1040

Natal Correspondence—Return presented, relative thereto [Address 9th July; *Captain Sinclair*]; to lie upon the Table 1040

QUESTIONS.

China—British Representation—Consul-General Warren—Question, Sir Edward Sassoon (Hythe); Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) 1040

Exports of Munitions of War to China—Question, Col. Pilkington (Lancashire, Newton); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1041

Recent News from China—Question, Mr. James Lowther (Kent, Thanet); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1041

South African War—Hospital and Medical Arrangements Inquiry—Questions, Mr. Pickersgill (Bethnal Green, S.W.), Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.) and Mr. Burdett-Coutts (Westminster); Answers, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.)... 1042

July 24.] *Page*

BOER PRISONERS AT PRETORIA — ATTEMPT TO BLOW UP MAGAZINE — Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien (Kilkenny); Answer, The Under Secretary of State for War (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 1043

BOER WOMEN SENT TO ENEMY'S LINES—Questions, Dr. Tanner (Cork County, Mid) and Sir Wilfrid Lawson (Cumberland, Cockermouth); Answers, Mr. Wyndham 1044

DOCTORS AND NURSES IN THE ORANGE RIVER COLONY—Question, Dr. Tanner; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1044

ARTILLERY AMMUNITION SUPPLIES — Question, Mr. Yerburgh (Chester); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1045

INOCULATION AGAINST TYPHOID—Questions, Mr. Channing (Northamptonshire, E.) and Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answers, Mr. Wyndham 1045

VOLUNTEERS AND GARRISON DUTY—Question, Mr. Seely (Lincoln); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1046

SMALL ARM AMMUNITION SUPPLIES—Question, Mr. Faber (York); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1046

STORES BORROWED BY ARMY FROM NAVY—Question, Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1047

SOUTH DENES CAMP—SISTERS OF NAZARETH—Question, Dr. Tanner; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1047

PUBLIC SCHOOL ARMY COMMISSIONS—ETON—Question, Major Rasch (Essex, S.E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1048

1ST VOLUNTEER BATTALION LEICESTERS—SUPPLY OF RIFLES—Question, Major Rasch; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1048

THE CHANNEL AND MEDITERRANEAN FLEETS—Questions, Sir John Colomb (Great Yarmouth) and Mr. Arnold-Forster (Belfast, W.); Answers, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Goschen, St. George's, Hanover Square) 1048

NAVAL COURT-MARTIAL—LAW OF EVIDENCE—Question, Mr. H. D. Greene (Shrewsbury); Answer, Mr. Goschen 1049

PORT GUARDSHIP FOR THE MERSEY—RECRUITING—Question, Mr. Charles M'Arthur (Liverpool, Exchange); Answer, Mr. Goschen 1049

NORTHERN TERRITORY OF AUSTRALIA—Question, Mr. Hogan (Tipperary, Mid); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. J. Chamberlain, Birmingham, W.) 1050

TONGA PROTECTORATE—Question, Mr. Hogan; Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain... 1050

INDIAN FAMINE—PRIVATE CHARITY—Question, Sir William Wedderburn (Banffshire); Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Lord George Hamilton, Middlesex, Ealing) 1051

CANADA AND THE INDIAN FAMINE—Question, Sir William Wedderburn; Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain 1052

RANGOON OUTRAGE—COMMAND OF THE ROYAL WEST KENT REGIMENT—Question, Sir Lewis M'Iver (Edinburgh, W.); Answer, Lord G. Hamilton 1052

FIELD BATTERIES IN INDIA—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, Lord G. Hamilton 1053

July 24.] *Page*

Receiving Homes for Pauper Children—Question, Mr. Flower (Bradford, W.); Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Chaplin, Lincolnshire, Sleaford) 1053

Feeble-Minded Paupers—Question, Mr. Flower; Answer, Mr. Chaplin ... 1053

Wandsworth Guardians and Deserted Children—Question, Mr. Flower; Answer, Mr. Chaplin 1054

Tuberculosis in West Cheshire—Question, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answer, Mr. Chaplin 1054

Wimbledon—Proposed School Board—Question, Mr. Price (Norfolk, E.); Answer, The Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education (Sir J. Gorst, Cambridge University) 1055

Holyhead National School—Religious Freedom of Teachers—Question Mr. Ellis Griffith (Anglesey); Answer, Sir J. Gorst 1055

Science and Art Instruction in London Board Schools—Question, Mr. Evelyn Cecil (Hertfordshire, Hertford); Answer, Sir J. Gorst 1057

General Post Office—Removal to Mount Pleasant—Overtime Allowances—Question, Mr. Steadman (Tower Hamlets, Stepney),; Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Hanbury, Preston) ... 1058

London Postal Delays—Suggested Inquiry—Question, Mr. Steadman; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1058

The Widening of Piccadilly—Questions, Mr. Coghill (Stoke-upon-Trent) and Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answer, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Akers Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) 1059

Dietary in Irish Workhouses — Question, Capt. Donelan (Cork, E.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. G. W. Balfour, Leeds, Central) 1059

Irish Land Purchase—The Ashbourne Act—Question, Capt. Donelan; Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour 1061

Boating in Howth Harbour—Questions, Mr. Patrick O'Brien; Answers, Mr. G. W. Balfour and Mr. Hanbury 1061

Fair Rent Appeals in Cork—Question, Mr. Maurice Healy (Cork); Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour 1062

Belfast Postal Arrangements—Question, Sir James Haslett (Belfast, N.); Answer, Mr. Hanbury 1063

Newbliss Rural Postman — Question, Mr. Macaleese (Monaghan, N.); Answer, Mr. Hanbury 1063

West Clare Fisheries—Question, Major Jameson (Clare, W.); Answer, The Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture for Ireland (Mr. Plunkett, Dublin County, S.) 1064

Salaries of Irish National Teachers—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien; Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour 1064

PUBLIC BUSINESS.

Money-Lending Bill [Lords]—Reported from the Standing Committee on Law, etc., with Amendments. Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 297.] Minutes of Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 297.] Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be considered upon Thursday, and to be printed. [Bill 312.]

Companies Bill—As amended (by the Standing Committee) considered.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion on the Paper in the name of the hon. Member for Northampton is not in order, as this is a Bill to amend the law relating to registered companies only, and does not relate to chartered companies.

A Clause (Application of the Act to Scotland)—(*The Lord Advocate*)—brought up, and read the first and second time, and added.

Question proposed, "That Clause 2 stand part of the Bill."

DISCUSSION:—

Mr. Radcliffe Cooke (*Hereford*) 1065
The President of the Board of Trade (*Mr. Ritchie, Croydon*) 1065
Mr. Bryce (*Aberdeen, S.*) ... 1065
Mr. Gibson Bowles (*Lynn Regis*) 1066
Sir Walter Foster (*Derbyshire, Ilkeston*) 1066
Sir James Haslett (*Belfast, N.*)... 1067
Mr. Lawson Walton (*Leeds, S.*)... 1067
Colonel Long (*Worcestershire, Evesham*) 1068
Sir J. B. Tuke (*Edinburgh and St. Andrew's University*) ... 1068

Question put and negatived.

Question, that Clause 3 stand part of the Bill, put and negatived.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 19, to leave out paragraph (ii.), of Sub-section (1), of Clause 4.'—(*Mr. Atherley-Jones.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out to the word 'for' in line 19, stand part of the Bill."

DISCUSSION:—

Mr. Ritchie 1070
Mr. Perks (*Lincolnshire, Louth*) 1071
Mr. Labouchere (*Northampton*) ... 1071

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 19, to leave out the words from the word 'association,' to the word, 'or,' in line 20."—(*Mr. H. S. Foster.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

DISCUSSION:—

Mr. Ritchie 1072
Sir Robert Reid (*Dumfries Burghs*) 1072
Mr. Tomlinson (*Preston*) ... 1073

Question put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 22, at the end, to insert the words, 'or a certificate signed by the secretary or acting secretary of the company that he is the registered holder of his qualification shares, if any."—(*Mr. Sydney Gedge.*)

July 24.] *Page*

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."
Mr. Ritchie 1073

Amendment proposed—
"In page 2, line 24, after the word 'company,' to insert the words 'or of the prospectus.'"—(*Mr. H. S. Foster.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."
The Attorney-General (*Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs*) 1074

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn

Amendment proposed—
"In page 2, line 30, to leave out the word 'passing,' and insert the word 'commencement.'"—(*Mr. H. S. Foster.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'passing' stand part of the Bill."
Mr. Ritchie 1074

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—
"In page 2, line 31, to leave out the words 'does not issue,' and insert the words 'is prohibited by its memorandum or articles of association from issuing.'"—(*Mr. Sydney Gedge.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'does not issue' stand part of the Bill."

DISCUSSION:—

Sir Robert Finlay 1074
Mr. Perks 1075
Mr. Marks (*Tower Hamlets, St. George's*) 1075
Sir Robert Reid 1076
Mr. McLaren (*Leicestershire, Bosworth*) 1077
Sir Albert Rollit (*Islington, S.*) 1077
Mr. Haldane (*Haddingtonshire*) 1078
The Solicitor-General (*Sir Edward Carson, Dublin University*) ... 1079
Mr. Labouchere 1079
Mr. Wallace (*Perth*) 1079
Sir Thomas Lea (*Londonderry, S.*) 1080
Mr. Bryce 1080
Mr. Bond (*Nottingham, E.*) ... 1080
Sir James Joicey 1081

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 168; Noes, 109. (Division List No. 234.)

Amendment proposed—
"In page 3, line 16, after the word 'allotment,' to insert the words 'save as provided by sub-section six of this section.'"—(*Mr. Sydney Gedge.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

DISCUSSION:—

Mr. Ritchie 1086
Mr. Perks 1086
Sir Alfred Hickman (*Wolverhampton, W.*) 1087
Sir Albert Rollit 1087
Sir Robert Reid 1088
Sir James Joicey 1088

Question put and negatived.

Amendment proposed—
"In Clause 6, page 3, line 17, to leave out 'for public,' and insert 'to the public for.'"—(*Mr. Ritchie.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 19, to leave out the words 'by the Memorandum or Articles of Association.'"—(*Mr. Bond.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. Ritchie ... ... 1089 *Mr Perks* 1089

Question put, and agreed to.

Other Amendments made.

Amendment proposed—

"In Clause 6, page 4, line 4, at end to insert 'from the expiration of the forty-eight days, provided that a director shall not be liable if he proves that the loss of the money was not due to any misconduct or negligence on his part.'"—(*Mr. Ritchie.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir Robert Reid 1091

Question put and agreed to.

Another Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 8, to leave out Sub-section 6 of Clause 6.'"—(*Mr. Marks.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out to the word 'for,' in line 9, stand part of the Bill."

DISCUSSION :—

Sir Robert Finlay ... ... 1092 *Mr. Lawson Walton* (*Leeds, S.*) 1094
Sir Robert Reid ... ... 1093 *Mr. Ritchie* 1095
Sir James Joicey ... ... 1094 *Mr. Bousfield* (*Hackney, N.*) ... 1095

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Other Amendments made.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 24, to leave out the words 'of the allotment,' and insert the words 'at which the default complained of might by reasonable diligence have been discovered by the persons seeking compensation.'"—(*Mr. Lawson Walton.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

DISCUSSION :—

Sir Robert Finlay ... ... 1097 *Sir James Joicey* 1099
Mr. Haldane ... ... 1098 *Sir Alfred Hickman* 1099
Mr. Ritchie ... ... 1098 *Mr. Hedderwick* (*Wick Burghs*) 1099
Mr. Bryce ... ... 1099 *Mr. Labouchere* 1100

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Another Amendment made.

Another Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 30, to leave out paragraph (b) of Sub-section (1) of Clause 8."—(*Mr. Perks.*)

Question proposed, "That paragraph (b) of Sub-section (1) of Clause 8 stand part of the Bill."

July 24.] Page

DISCUSSION :—

Sir Robert Finlay ... 1102 *Sir Robert Reid* 1103

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment moved, "In Clause 8, p. 5, line 17, to omit the words 'which has commenced business,' in order to insert 'registered.'"—(*Mr. H. S. Foster.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 19, to leave out Sub-section 7."—(*Mr. Marks.*)

Question proposed, "That Sub-section (7) stand part of the Bill."

DISCUSSION :—

Sir Robert Finlay 1105
Mr. Faithfull Begg (*Glasgow, St. Rollox*)... ... 1105
Mr. Ritchie 1105
Mr. Billson (*Halifax*) ... 1106
Mr. Bryce 1106
Mr. H. S. Foster 1106
Sir James Joicey 1106
Mr. Perks 1107
Sir Edward Carson 1107
Mr. Tomlinson 1107

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 22, after the word 'shares,' to insert the words 'as the result of a public issue.'"—(*Mr. Harry Foster.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. Sydney Gedge (*Walsall*) 1108 *Mr. Marks* 1108

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Verbal Amendment made.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 31, to leave out the word 'number' and insert the word 'numbers.'"—(*Mr Sydney Gedge.*)

"Question proposed, "That the word 'number' stand part of the Bill."

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. Faithfull Begg ... 1109 *Mr. Ritchie* 1109

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Other Amendments made.

Amendment proposed :—

"In page 5, line 38, to leave out Clause 10."—(*Mr. Atherley-Jones.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'Upon any offer of shares' stand part of the Bill."

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. Phillips (*Pembroke*) ... 1111
Mr. Ritchie 1111
Sir Robert Reid 1112
Mr. Sydney Gedge 1113
Mr. Faithfull Begg ... 1115
Mr. Labouchere 1117
Sir Robert Finlay 1118
Mr. Bryce 1120
Mr. Marks... 1122
Mr. Banbury (*Camberwell, Peckham*) 1123
Mr. Lawson Walton 1124
Mr. Bousfield (*Hackney*) ... 1124
Mr. Lough (*Islington, W.*) ... 1125
Mr. H. S. Foster 1126
Mr. Perks 1127
Mr. Butcher (*York*) 1127

July 24.] Page

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 160 ; Noes, 32. (Division List No. 235.)

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 38, to leave out the words 'for public,' and insert the words 'to the public for.'"—(*Mr. Ritchie.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'for public' stand part of the Bill."

Discussion :—

Mr. Faithfull Begg ... 1129
Mr. Ritchie 1129
Mr. H. S. Foster 1130
Sir Thomas Lea 1130
Mr. Sydney Gedge 1130
Mr. Lough 1131
Mr. Bousfield 1131

Question put, and negatived.

Question proposed, "That the words 'to the public for' be there inserted."

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"To leave out the words 'to the public.'"—(*Mr. Sydney Gedge.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'to the public' stand part of the proposed Amendment."

Discussion :—

Mr. H. S. Foster 1132
Sir Robert Finlay 1133
Mr. Bousfield 1133
Mr. Marks 1133
Mr. Phillips 1133
Mr. Tomlinson 1134
Mr. Bryce 1134
Colonel Milward (*Warwickshire, Stratford-upon-Avon*) 1134
Major Jameson (*Clare, W.*) ... 1134
Mr. Faithfull Begg 1134
Mr. Perks 1135
Mr. Brodie Hoare (*Hampstead*) ... 1136
Mr. Lawson Walton 1136
Mr. Bond 1136
Mr. Lough 1136

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 136 ; Noes, 61. (Division List No. 236.)

Words inserted.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 4, after the first word 'and,' to insert the words 'in case the said commission, with brokerage, exceeds two and a half per cent. are.'"—(*Mr. Henderson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Ritchie 1140
Mr. Cawley (*Lancashire, Prestwich*) 1141
Mr. Philipps 1141
Mr. Lough 1142
Mr. Bousfield 1143

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 44; Noes, 128. (Division List No. 237.)

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 33, after the word 'filed,' to insert as a new sub-section the words '(4) Where no prospectus is issued a memorandum complying with the terms of this section shall be filed in manner aforesaid.'"—(*Mr Lawson Walton.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

July 24.] Page

DISCUSSION :—

Sir Robert Finlay 1148
Mr. Marks... 1148
Major Jameson 1150
Mr. Bainbridge (*Lincolnshire, Gainsborough*) 1150

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 35 ; Noes, 107. (Division List No. 238.)

Mr. Sydney Gedge 1151

Question put—

"That further proceeding on consideration, as amended, be now adjourned."

The House divided :—Ayes, 32 ; Noes, 101. (Division List No. 239.)

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 37, to leave out the words from the word 'association to the word 'the,' in line 39."—(*Mr. H. S. Foster.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Ritchie 1155
Mr. Bousfield 1155
Mr. Sydney Gedye ... 1155
Mr. Bainbridge 1155
Major Jameson 1155
Mr. Lowe (*Birmingham, Edgbaston*) 1156
Mr. Billson (*Halifax*) 1156
Mr. Lough 1156
Mr. T. M. Healy (*Louth, N.*) ... 1157

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 102; Noes, 18. (Division List No. 240.)

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, line 34, after the word 'specifying,' to insert the words 'if possible.'"—(*Mr. H. S. Foster.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'if possible' be there inserted."

Mr. Ritchie... 1157

Question put, and negatived.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, line 35, after the word 'paid,' to insert the words 'by any 'person.'"—(*Mr. Bousfield.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

DISCUSSION : —

Mr. Ritchie 1159
Mr. Bainbridge 1159
Mr. H. S. Foster 1159
Mr. Sydney Gedge... ... 1159
Mr. Ritchie 1160
Mr. Lawson Walton 1160
Major Jameson 1160

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Other Amendments made.

Further proceedings on Consideration, as amended, adjourned till To-morrow.

Motion made, and Question "That this House do now adjourn"—(*Sir William Walrond*)—put and agreed to.

Adjourned at a quarter after One of the clock.

July 25.]

Page

COMMONS: WEDNESDAY, 25TH JULY, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

South Eastern Metropolitan Tramways Bill—Portland Urban District Gas Bill—Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to 1161

Liverpool Overhead Railway Bill [Lords]—A verbal Amendment made; Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 1161

North Eastern Railway Bill [Lords]—As amended, to be considered To-morrow... 1161

North Eastern Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill [Lords]—As amended, considered. Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*) Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed, with Amendments... 1161

Hemel Hempstead Corporation Water Bill [Lords] (By Order.) As amended, considered; an Amendment made; Bill to be read the third time 1161

Fraser Settled Chattels Bill [Lords]—Read a second time, and committed... 1161

Bournemouth Corporation Bill [Lords]—Ordered, That Standing Order 211 be suspended, and that the Committee on the Bournemouth Corporation Bill [Lords] have leave to sit and proceed forthwith.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*) 1161

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill [Lords]—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 1161

PETITIONS.

Licensed Premises (Hours of Sales) (Scotland) Bill—Petition from Cupar, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1161

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children (No. 2) Bill—Petition from West Ham, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1161

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

MARRIAGE ACT, 1898—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 18th June; *Mr. Price*]; to lie upon the Table 1161

NATIONAL GALLERY (IRELAND)—Copy presented, of Report of the Director of the National Gallery of Ireland to the Board of Governors and Guardians, for the year 1899 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1161

METRIC SYSTEM (FOREIGN COUNTRIES) (COMMERCIAL, No. 3, 1900)—Copy presented, of Reports from Her Majesty's Representatives in Europe on the Metric System, Part I. [by Command]; to lie upon the Table ... 1161

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES)—Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 2,485 to 2,487 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1161

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE—Second Report, with Minutes of Evidence, and an Appendix, brought up, and read. Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 298.] 1161

PUBLIC PETITIONS COMMITTEE—Ninth Report brought up, and read; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 1161

July 25.] *Page*

Reserve Forces Bill [H.L.]—As amended, considered

Amendment proposed—

"In line 15, to leave out 'the first day of June, 1900,' in order to insert 'the passing of this Act.'"—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

The Under-Secretary of State for War (*Mr. Wyndham, Dover*) 1163

Amendment agreed to.

Bill read a third time, and passed, with Amendments.

SUPPLY—Considered in Committee.

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1900–1901.

CLASS II.

Motion made, and question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £32,250, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Department of Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies, including a Grant in aid of certain Expenses connected with Emigration."

Mr. Sydney Buxton (*Tower Hamlets, Poplar*) 1164

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item A (Salaries) be reduced by £100, in respect of the Salary of the Secretary of State."—(*Sir Wilfred Lawson.*)

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. Arthur Elliot (*Durham*) 1175
Sir Robert Reid (*Dumfries Burghs*) 1179
The Secretary of State for the Colonies (*Mr. J. Chamberlain, Birmingham, W.*) ... 1186
Mr. Lloyd-George (*Carnarvon Borough*) 1199
Mr. Evelyn Cecil (*Hertfordshire, Hertford*) 1212
Mr. Labouchere (*Northampton*) ... 1217
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (*Stirling Burghs*) 1230
The First Lord of the Treasury (*Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester*) 1239
Mr. Courtney (*Cornwall, Bodmin*) 1243
Sir Edward Gray (*Northumberland, Berwick*) 1251
Mr. Bryce (*Aberdeen, S.*) ... 1254

MR. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 169 ; Noes, 100. (Division List No. 241.)

Question put accordingly.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 52 ; Noes, 208. (Division List No. 242.)

MR. A. J. BALFOUR claimed, "That the Original Question be now put."

Original Question put accordingly.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 176 ; Noes, 41. (Division List No. 243.)

Resolution to be reported To-morrow ; Committee to sit again To-morrow.

In pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th day of this instant July, Mr. Speaker adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at half after Seven of the clock.

Page

LORDS: THURSDAY, 26TH JULY, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with:—London, Walthamstow, and Epping Forest Railway (Abandonment). The same was ordered to lie on the Table 1265

Bray and Enniskerry Railway Bill—Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, the opposition thereto having been withdrawn; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. The Orders made on the 13th instant and Thursday last discharged; and Bill committed forthwith 1265

London Sea Water Supply Bill [H.L.]—Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to 1265

Tramways Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill—Reported from the Select Committee with an Amendment, and committed to a Committee of the whole House To morrow 1265

Durham (County of) Electric Power Supply Bill—Reported from the Select Committee with Amendments 1265

Tottenham Urban District Council Bill—Reported from the Select Committee with Amendments 1265

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill—Reported from the Select Committee with an Amendment, and committed to a Committee of the whole House To-morrow 1265

Devonport Corporation Bill—Reported with Amendments 1265

Hastings Corporation Bill—The Queen's consent signified; and Bill reported with Amendments 1266

Newcastle-upon-Tyne Electric Supply Bill—The Queen's consent signified; and Bill reported from the Select Committee with Amendments 1266

Coventry Corporation Bill; Taunton Corporation Bill; Gas Light and Coke, Commercial Gas and South Metropolitan Gas Companies Bill; now Metropolis Gas (Prepayment Meter) Act, 1900; Southport Corporation Bill—Reported with Amendments 1266

Bradford Corporation Bill—Read 3ª, with the Amendments; a further Amendment made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons 1266

Halifax Corporation Bill; Oldham Corporation Bill—Read 3ª, with the Amendments; further Amendments made; Bills passed, and returned to the Commons 1266

Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill—Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 1266

City of London (Various Powers) Bill—Read 3ª, with the Amendments; a further Amendment made; Bill passed and returned to the Commons ... 1266

Market Weighton Drainage and Navigation Bill; Cumberland County Council (Bridges) Bill; Charing Cross and Strand Electricity Supply Bill; Croydon Tramways and Improvements Bill—Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 1266

July 26.] *Page*

South Eastern Metropolitan Tramways Bill; Portland Urban District Gas Bill—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to... 1266

Burnley Corporation Bill [H.L.]—Returned from the Commons with the Amendment made by the Lords to the Amendments made by the Commons agreed to 1267

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill [H.L.] —Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]; Liverpool Overhead Railway Bill [H.L.]—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments 1267

Glasgow Building Regulations Bill [H.L.] -Motherwell and Bellshill Railway Bill [H.L.]; North Eastern Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill [H.L.]; Rotherham Corporation Bill [H.L.]—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to 1267

Dublin Corporation Bill—Clontarf Urban District Council Bill—Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; and referred to the Examiners 1267

Shannon Water and Electric Power Bill; South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Bill; North Metropolitan Electric Power Supply Bill—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Lord Stanmore and the Lord Glanesk be proposed to the House as Members of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of Lord Wolverton and the Lord Aberdare; read, and agreed to 1267

Paisley Waterworks Provisional Order Confirmation Bill—Moved, That the Order made on the 12th March last, "That no Provisional Order Confirmation Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 26th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2ª; agreed to. Bill read 2ª accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the whole House To-morrow 1267

Edinburgh (Housing of Working Class) Improvement Scheme Provisional Order Confirmation Bill—Moved, That the Order made on the 12th March last, "That no Provisional Order Confirmation Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 26th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2ª; agreed to. Bill read 2ª accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the whole House To-morrow 1268

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill -Amendments reported (according to Order), and Bill to be read 3ª to-morrow ... 1268

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 14) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill; Perth and Paisley Gas Provisional Orders Bill—House in Committee (according to Order). Bill reported without amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bills to be read 3ª to-morrow 1268

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

AFRICA, No. 6 (1900)—Preliminary Report by Her Majesty's Special Commissioner on the Protectorate of Uganda 1268

COMMERCIAL, No. 3 (1900)—Reports from Her Majesty's Representatives in Europe on the metric system. Part I. 1268

July 26.] *Page*

TRADE REPORTS—ANNUAL SERIES—No. 2485. France (French Indo-China); No. 2486. Roumania; No. 2487. China (Tientsin)... 1268

NATIONAL GALLERY (IRELAND)—Report of the Director of the National Gallery of Ireland to the Board of Governors and Guardians, for the year 1899 1268

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION—Statistics of proceedings under the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1897, and the Employers' Liability Act, 1880, during the year 1899 1269

HISTORICAL MANUSCRIPTS (ROYAL COMMISSION)—Reports on the manuscripts of:—1, Mrs. Frankland-Russell-Astley, of Chequers Court, Bucks; 2, Lord Montagu, of Beaulieu, Hants; 3, Beverley Corporation. Presented [by Command], and ordered to lie upon the Table 1269

Reserve Forces Bill [H.L.]—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments 1269

Merchant Shipping (Liability of Shipowners and others) Bill [THIRD READING]—Order of the Day for the Third Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read the third time."—(*Lord Heneage.*)

Amendment moved—

"To leave out 'now' and insert at the end of the motion, 'this day three months.'"—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

DISCUSSION:—

Earl Egerton ... ... 1270 *The Earl of Kimberley* 1273
Lord Heneage ... ... 1271 *Lord Alverstone* 1274

On Question whether "now" shall stand part of the motion, their Lordships divided:—Contents, 51; Non-Contents, 22.

Bill read 3ª, with the Amendment, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

County and Borough Franchise Assimilation (London) Bill—Read 3ª (according to Order), and passed 1275

Town Councils (Scotland) Bill—Amendments reported (according to Order), and Bill to be read 3ª on Tuesday next 1275

Tithe Rent-Charge (Ireland) Bill—Amendments reported (according to Order) 1275

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 3, page 3, line 5, after Sub-section (3) to insert Sub-section (4):—'(4) Where a tithe-rent charge has been varied by any order of a court of quarter sessions made after the passing of the Irish Church Act, 1869, the amount at which it stood before the making of the order shall, for the purposes of this clause, be taken and deemed to be the amount at which it stood on the twenty-second day of August, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-four.'"—(*Lord Cloncurry.*)

The Lord Chancellor of Ireland (*Lord Ashbourne*) 1275

Amendment, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

Amendment moved—

"To leave out Clause 8."—(*The Earl of Arran.*)

July 26.] *Page*

DISCUSSION :—

The Earl of Mayo ... 1277 *Lord Ashbourne* 1277

On Question whether the clause shall stand part of the Bill, their Lordships divided :—Contents, 45 ; Non-Contents, 28.

Amendment moved—

"To leave out Clause 9."—(*Lord Clonbrock.*)

DISCUSSION :—

The Earl of Erne ... 1281 *Lord Ashbourne* 1282
The Earl of Mayo ... 1282

On Question, That Clause 9 stand part of the Bill, agreed to.

Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow.

Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill —Amendments reported (according to Order), and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow... 1283

Cruelty to Wild Animals in Captivity Bill—Bill read 3ª (according to Order).

Amendments agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 4, line 26, after '1876' to insert 'nor to the hunting or coursing of any animal which has not been liberated in a mutilated or injured state in order to facilitate its capture or destruction.'"—(*Lord James of Hereford.*)

The Earl of Cork 1284

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"To insert as a new clause, 'This Act shall not extend to Scotland.'"—(*Lord James of Hereford.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.

Lunacy Board (Scotland) (Salaries, etc.) Bill — House in Committee (according to Order). Bill reported without amendment; and re-committed to the Standing Committee 1284

Prohibition of Exportation of Arms Bill [H.L.]—Amendment made ; Bill read 3ª (according to Order), and passed, and sent to the Commons ... 1285

Oil in Tobacco Bill—[SECOND READING]—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Viscount Cross.*)

On Question agreed to ; Bill read 2ª accordingly and committed to a Committee of the whole House To-morrow 1285

MILITIA ORGANISATION—

DISCUSSION :—

Lord Braye ... ... 1285 *The Secretary of State for War* (*The Marquess of Lansdowne*) 1286

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—THE COLONIAL TROOPS AND WAR MEDALS—

DISCUSSION :—

Earl Carrington ... ... 1289 *Lord Strathcona and Mount Royal* 1290
The Marquess of Lansdowne 1289

House adjourned at twenty minutes before Seven of the clock.

COMMONS: THURSDAY, 26TH JULY, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Dublin Corporation Bill—Order for consideration, as amended, read.

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. T. M. Healy (*Louth, N.*) 1290 *Sir U. Kay-Shuttleworth* (*Lancashire, Clitheroe*) 1291

Question proposed, "That the Bill be now considered."

Bill considered.

A Clause added.

Amendments made.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time."—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. Whitmore (*Chelsea*) ... 1293 *The Chief Secretary for Ireland* (*Mr. G. W. Balfour, Leeds, Central*) 1294
Sir Robert Mowbray (*Lambeth, Brixton*) 1293
Mr. T. M. Healy ... ... 1294 *Mr. Harwood* (*Bolton*) 1295

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Barnsley Corporation Bill [Lords]; Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway Bill [Lords]; North British Railway Bill [Lords]—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 1295

Ramsgate Corporation Improvements Bill [Lords]—Queen's consent signified; read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 1295

North Eastern Railway Bill [Lords] (By Order)—As amended, considered, an Amendment made.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Queen's consent signified; Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 1295

Clontarf Urban District Council Bill—Ordered, That, in the case of the Clontarf Urban District Council Bill, Standing Orders 84, 214, and 239 be suspended, and that the Bill be now taken into consideration, provided amended prints shall have been previously deposited—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Bill accordingly considered, as amended.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Queen's consent signified; Bill read the third time, and passed ... 1295

July 26.] *Page*

Glasgow District Tramways Bill [Lords] (By Order)—Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be re-committed to the former Committee."—Debate arising. Motion made, and Question, "That the Debate be now adjourned," put, and negatived 1296

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 3) Bill [Lords]—Ordered, That, in the case of the Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 3) Bill [Lords], Standing Orders 211 and 236 be suspended, and that the Committee on the Bill have leave to sit and proceed upon Monday next.—(*Mr. Caldwell*) 1296

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 4) Bill [Lords]—Ordered, That, in the case of the Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 4) Bill [Lords], Standing Orders 211 and 236 be suspended, and that the Committee on the Bill have leave to sit and proceed upon Monday next.—(*Mr. Caldwell*) 1296

Dublin Corporation Bill and Clontarf Urban District Council Bill—Ordered, That the Minutes of Proceedings of the Joint Committee on the Dublin Corporation Bill and Clontarf Urban District Council Bill be printed. [No. 301] 1296

Sheffield Corporation Bill [Lords]—Reported from the Select Committee on Police and Sanitary Regulations Bills (Section A), with Amendments. Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 1296

Message from the Lords—That they have agreed to—Great Indian Peninsula Railway Company Bill, without Amendment.

That they have agreed to—London County Council (Money) Bill; Ilfracombe Improvement Bill; London and North Western Railway (Wales) Bill; East London Water Bill; London and North Western Railway Bill; Blackpool, St. Anne's, and Lytham Tramways Bill, with Amendments.

That they have agreed to Amendments to—Great Grimsby Street Tramways Bill [Lords], Margate Pier and Harbour Bill [Lords], Bury and District Water (Transfer) Bill [Lords], Preston Corporation Bill [Lords], without Amendment... 1296

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Marriage Act, 1898—Return [presented 25th July] to be printed. [No. 299] 1297

Historical Manuscripts (Royal Commission)—Copy presented, of Report on the Manuscripts of Mrs. Frankland-Russell-Astley, of Chequers Court, Bucks [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

Copy presented, of Report on the Manuscripts of Lord Montagu, of Beaulieu, Hants [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

Copy presented, of Report on the Manuscripts of Beverley Corporation [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1297

Workmen's Compensation—Copy presented, of Statistics of Proceedings under the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1897, and the Employers' Liability Act, 1880, during the year 1899 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1297

National Education (Ireland)—Copy presented, of Sixty-sixth Report of the Commissioners, being for the year 1899–1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

July 26.] *Page*

Copy presented, of Section I. of the Appendix to the Sixty-sixth Report of the Commissioners [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

Copy presented, of Section II. of the Appendix to the Sixty-sixth Report of the Commissioners [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

Copy presented, of Section III. of the Appendix to the Sixty-sixth Report of the Commissioners [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

Copy presented, of Section IV. of the Appendix to the Sixty-sixth Report of the Commissioners [by Command]; to lie upon the Table ... 1297

AFRICA (No. 6, 1900)—Copy presented, of Preliminary Report by Her Majesty's Special Commissioner on the Protectorate of Uganda [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1298

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE—Inquiry into Charities (Administrative County of Durham).—Further Return relative thereto [ordered 14th February; *Mr. Grant Lawson*]; to be printed. [No. 300] 1298

LONDON (EQUALISATION OF RATES) ACT, 1894 (ACCOUNTS UNDER SECTION 1 (7) OF THE ACT)—Return ordered, "showing, according to the Accounts for the twelve months preceding the 31st day of March, 1900, furnished to the Local Government Board under Section 1 (7) of the London (Equalisation of Rates) Act, 1894—

(1) The sanitary authorities to whom payments under the Act were made by the London County Council during the year;

(2) The amount so received by each sanitary authority during the year;

(3) The amount of the expenses incurred during the year by each such sanitary authority (*a*) under the Public Health (London) Act, 1891 (including expenses of scavenging streets); (*b*) in respect of lighting; and (*c*) in respect of streets (other than the expenses of scavenging); and

(4) The amount expended during the year by each such sanitary authority out of the sums received by them under the Act;

(in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 323, of Session 1899)."—(*Mr. T. W. Russell*) 1298

QUESTIONS.

CHINA—ANTI-FOREIGN OUTBREAK—RECENT NEWS—CHINA PAPERS—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) 1298

HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL ARRANGEMENTS IN CHINA—Question, Mr. Herbert Roberts (Denbighshire, W.); Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Lord G. Hamilton, Middlesex, Ealing) 1299

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL ARRANGEMENTS INQUIRY—Questions, Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.) and Mr. Pickersgill (Bethnal Green, S.W.); Answers, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 1299

MARTIAL LAW IN CAPE COLONY—Question, Mr. Humphreys-Owen (Montgomeryshire); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. J. Chamberlain, Birmingham W.) 1301

July 26.] *Page*

ARMY MEDICAL DEPARTMENT—CIVIL SURGEONS—ALLEGED PLEDGE OF SECRECY—Questions, Dr. Farquharson (Aberdeenshire, W.) and Dr. Tanner (Cork County, Mid); Answer, The Under Secretary of State for War (Mr. Wyndham, Dover)... 1301

COMFORTS FOR THE TROOPS—FAILURES IN DELIVERY—Question, Mr. H. S. Foster (Suffolk, Lowestoft); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1302

HONNEY SPRUIT DISASTER—Question, Captain Norton (Newington, W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1302

BOER WOMEN SENT TO THE ENEMY'S LINES—Question, Dr. Tanner; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1303

RESERVISTS' PAY AND ALLOWANCES—Question, Mr. Shee (Waterford, W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1303

SOUTH CORK ARTILLERY MILITIA—CAMDEN FORT ACCIDENT—Questions, Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.) and Mr. Patrick O'Brien (Kilkenny); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1304

JERSEY MILITIA GARRISON — Question, Mr. Lambert (Devonshire, South Molton); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1305

ARMY HEAD-DRESS—SOLDIER'S DEATH AT YARMOUTH—Question, Mr. Soames (Norfolk, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1305

SALFORD VOLUNTEER ENGINEERS—Question, Sir J. W. Maclure (Lancashire, Stretford); Answer, Mr. Wyndham... 1305

ALDERSHOT — RECREATIONS FOR TROOPS — Question, Capt. Norton; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1306

RECRUITING—STATISTICS—Question, Mr. Shee; Answer, Mr. Wyndham ... 1306

PROMOTION BOARD—Questions, General Laurie (Pembroke and Haverfordwest) and Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answers, Mr. Wyndham 1307

ARMSTRONG'S MANCHESTER WORKS—WAGES—Question, Mr. Woods (Essex, Walthamstow); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the War Office (Mr. J. Powell Williams, Birmingham, S.) 1308

WOOLWICH ARSENAL—ACCIDENT IN 1881—JAMES QUINLAN—Question, Dr. Tanner; Answer, Mr. J. Powell Williams 1309

DUKE OF YORK'S SCHOOL — Question, Dr. Farquharson; Answer, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Akers Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) ... 1309

FRENCH SUBMARINE BOATS—Question, Mr. Harwood (Bolton); Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Goschen, St. George's, Hanover Square) 1310

H.M.S. "REVENGE"—CORDITE EXPLOSION—Question, Admiral Field (Sussex, Eastbourne); Answer, Mr. Goschen... 1310

FIRST SEA LORD—OFFICIAL RESIDENCE—Question, Admiral Field; Answer, Mr. Goschen 1310

COMMITTEE ON NAVY BOILERS—Question, Sir U. Kay-Shuttleworth (Lancashire, Clitheroe); Answer, Mr. Goschen 1311

THE VISIT OF THE SHAH OF PERSIA—SUGGESTED NAVAL REVIEW—Question, Sir Edward Gourley (Sunderland); Answer, Mr. Goschen 1311

THE SAILING TRAINING SQUADRON—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answer, Mr. Goschen 1312

COAL SUPPLY—RESERVE FOR NAVAL PURPOSES—PROHIBITION OF EXPORTATION OF ARMS BILL—Questions, Mr. Harwood and Mr. Firbank (Hull, E.); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1313

INDIAN RAILWAY—FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS—Question, Mr. A. H. A. Morton (Deptford); Answer, Lord G. Hamilton 1314

BRITISH OFFICERS IN INDIAN NATIVE REGIMENTS—Question, Mr. Stanhope (Burnley); Answer, Lord G. Hamilton 1314

INDIAN TRADE STATISTICS—Question, Sir Mancherjee Bhownaggree (Bethnal Green, N.E.); Answer, Lord G. Hamilton 1315

THE "KOWSHING"—Question, Sir Mark Stewart (Kirkcudbrightshire); Answer, Mr. Brodrick... 1315

VACCINE LYMPH—Question, Mr. Thomas Bayley (Derbyshire, Chesterfield); Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Chaplin, Lincolnshire, Sleaford) 1315

FOOD PRESERVATIVES—Questions, Mr. Lambert and Mr. T. M. Healy (Louth, N.); Answers, Mr. Chaplin... 1316

DIDSBURY VOLUNTARY SCHOOL RATE—Question, Mr Carvell Williams (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield); Answer, Mr Chaplin 1317

BURNLEY MINERS—CHECK-WEIGHING CLAUSES—Question, Mr. Stanhope; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir M. White Ridley, Lancashire, Blackpool) 1317

DANGEROUS TRADE REGULATIONS—REDUCTION OF ARSENIC—Question, Mr. Tennant (Berwickshire); Answer, Sir M. White Ridley 1318

MARINE BIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION—PLYMOUTH LABORATORY—STOCKHOLM CONFERENCE—Questions, Mr. Price (Norfolk, E.); Answers, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Ritchie, Croydon) 1319

JERSEY PASSENGER STEAMER SERVICE—Question, Mr. Lambert; Answer, Mr. Ritchie... 1319

RAILWAY PASSENGERS' LUGGAGE—Question, Sir Cameron Gull (Devonshire, Barnstaple); Answer, Mr. Ritchie 1321

GREAT NORTHERN RAILWAY FARES—Question, Mr. Stephens (Middlesex, Hornsey); Answer, Mr. Ritchie 1321

SUBURBAN RAILWAY FARES—Question, Mr. Stephens; Answer, Mr. Ritchie... 1321

GREAT EASTERN RAILWAY—LABOUR DISPUTE—Questions, Mr. Trevelyan (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland), Mr. Ernest Gray (West Ham, N.) and Mr. Tennant; Answers, Mr. Ritchie 1322

LAND REVENUE RECORDS—Question, Mr. Woods; Answer, The Attorney-General (Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs) 1323

PALACE OF WESTMINSTER — ACCOMMODATION FOR MEMBERS—Question, Mr. Harwood; Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas 1324

July 26.] *Page*

COMMITTEE ROOMS—OUTSIDE BLINDS—VENTILATION—Questions, Mr. Cohen (Islington, E.) and Sir J. Colomb (Gt. Yarmouth); Answers, Mr. Akers-Douglas 1325

NORWOOD GREEN (MIDDLESEX) POSTAL DELIVERIES—Question, Mr. Bigwood (Middlesex, Brentford); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Hanbury, Preston) 1325

STAW HATS FOR POSTMEN—Questions, Dr. Tanner, Mr. Steadman (Tower Hamlets, Stepney), and Mr. Labouchere (Northampton); Answers, Mr. Hanbury 1326

POSTMEN'S HOLIDAYS—Question, Mr. Steadman; Answer, Mr. Hanbury ... 1326

PORTERS' EXAMINATIONS—Question, Mr. T. D. Sullivan (Donegal, W.); Answer, Mr. Hanbury 1327

THE DISTRICT MESSENGER COMPANY—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answer, Mr. Hanbury 1327

JUNIOR CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINATIONS—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Hanbury 1329

CUSTOMS WATCHERS—Question, Mr. Steadman; Answer, Mr. Hanbury ... 1330

SCOTTISH SHERIFF COURT PROCEDURE—Question, Mr. Wallace (Perth); Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire) ... 1330

CARRICKMACROSS WORKHOUSE—Question, Mr. Daly (Monaghan, S.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. G. W. Balfour, Leeds, Central) ... 1331

DROMORE RIVER FLOODS—Question, Mr. Daly; Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour... 1331

LIMERICK TELEGRAPH MESSENGERS—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Hanbury 1332

CAHIR POST OFFICE—Question, Mr. Mandeville (Tipperary, S.); Answer, Mr. Hanbury 1332

DUBLIN SORTING STAFF—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Hanbury 1332

COUNTY KILKENNY POSTAL ARRANGEMENTS—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Hanbury 1333

COAGH (TYRONE) POSTAL SERVICE—Question, Mr. Doogan (Tyrone, E.); Answer, Mr. Hanbury 1333

BUNDORAN MAILS—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. Hanbury ... 1334

DRUMCONRATH POSTAL ARRANGEMENTS—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Hanbury 1335

CORK POSTAL ARRANGEMENTS—Question, Mr. Maurice Healy (Cork); Answer, Mr. Hanbury 1335

CLONES WATER SUPPLY—Question, Mr. Macaleese (Monaghan, N.); Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour 1336

ROSSAVALLEY (FERMANAGH) TENANTRY—Question, Mr. Doogan; Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour 1336

IRISH PUBLIC HOUSE LICENCES—Question, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour 1337

THE BREHON LAWS—Question, Mr. T. D. Sullivan; Answer, Mr. Hanbury... 1337

July 26.] *Page*

IRISH TENANCY CONTRACTS—Question, Sir Walter Foster (Derbyshire, Ilkeston); Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour 1337

MEATH COUNTY COUNCIL—Question, Mr. T. M. Healy; Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour... 1338

FISHGUARD AND ROSSLARE RAILWAYS—Questions, Mr. Maurice Healy and Capt. Donelan (Cork, E.): Answer, Mr. Hanbury 1338

SUTTON TO CENSURE RAILWAY—Question, Mr. T. M. Healy; Answer, The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.) 1339

IRISH RAILWAY AMALGAMATION BILL — Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1339

IRISH TENANTS AND POOR RATE DEDUCTIONS—Question, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answer, Mr. Atkinson 1340

POTATO CROP—EXPERIMENTS WITH ELECTRICAL CONDUCTORS — Question, Mr. Austin (Limerick, W.); Answer, The Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture for Ireland (Mr. Plunkett, Dublin County, S.) ... 1340

IRISH SCHOOL TEACHERS' BONUS — Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien; Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour 1341

IRISH NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS' INCOME — Question, Mr. Macaleese; Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour 1341

TEACHERS IN POOR LAW SCHOOLS—Questions, Capt. Donelan and Mr. Maurice Healy; Answers, Mr. G. W. Balfour 1342

CANADIAN EXPORTS TO GERMANY—Question, General Laurie; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1343

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—Questions, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs) and Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1343

PUBLIC BUSINESS.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES)—Mr. HALSEY reported from the Committee of Selection, That they had discharged the following Members from the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures:—Mr. Brodie Hoare, Mr. Charles M'Arthur, and Sir James Woodhouse; and had appointed in substitution: Mr. Round, Mr. Kemp, and Mr. John Wilson (Durham.)

Mr. HALSEY further reported from the Committee, That they had discharged the following Members from the Standing Committee on Law and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure:—Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. H. S. Foster, Mr. Flower, and Mr. Yerburgh; and had appointed in substitution: The Lord Advocate, Mr. Loder, Colonel Milward, and Viscount Cranborne. Reports to lie upon the Table 1344

Members of Local Authorities Relief Bill [Lords]—Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 313] 1345

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS—That they have agreed to—Beer Retailers' and Spirit Grocers' Licences (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill, with Amendments.

That they have agreed to—Amendment to Inebriates Amendment (Scotland) Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill intituled, "An Act to Amend the Law relating to the Exportation of Arms, Ammunition, and Military and Naval Stores." Prohibition of Exportation of Arms Bill [Lords]... ... 1345

July 26.] *Page*

Prohibition of Exportation of Arms Bill [Lords]—Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 314] 1345

Quarries (Re-committed) Bill—Order for Committee [this day] read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 1345

East India Revenue Accounts—Order for Committee read 1345

The Indian Budget—Financial Statement—

The Secretary of State for India (*Lord G. Hamilton, Middlesex, Ealing*) 1345

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Speaker do now leave the Chair."—(*Lord G. Hamilton.*)

Discussion:—

Sir Henry Fowler (*Wolverhampton, E.*) 1366
Mr. Souttar (*Dumfriesshire*) 1372
Sir William Wedderburn (*Banffshire*) 1379

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out from the word 'That,' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words 'looking to the special needs of the famine-stricken people in India at the present time, this House recognises that funds are urgently required to feed, clothe, and house the cultivators in their villages until their crops are ripe; to provide them with plough cattle, seed, and other requisites of cultivation; and to restore them to their normal economic condition; that these requirements cannot be adequately met from Indian revenues raised from the suffering Indian people, and within the necessarily restricted field of ordinary relief operations; that the funds subscribed by charity are altogether insufficient for these purposes; and this House is therefore of opinion that a large and generous free grant should be provided to assist in meeting this unprecedented calamity,' instead thereof."—(*Mr. Souttar*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Discussion:—

The Chancellor of the Exchequer (*Sir M. Hicks-Beach, Bristol, W.*) ... 1383
Mr. Maclean (*Cardiff*) ... 1387
Mr. Joseph Walton (*Yorkshire, Barnsley*) 1394
Sir Mancherjee Bhownaggree (*Bethnal Green, N.E.*) ... 1398
Mr. Herbert Roberts (*Denbighshire, W.*) 1405
Sir Edgar Vincent (*Exeter*) 1412
Mr. Pickersgill (*Bethnal Green, S.W.*) 1417
Colonel Milward (*Warwickshire, Stratford-upon-Avon*) 1421
Mr. Emmott (*Oldham*) 1424
The First Lord of the Treasury (*Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.*) 1428
Mr. Samuel Smith (*Flintshire*) ... 1434
Mr. Maddison (*Sheffield, Brightside*) 1435

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 112; Noes, 65. (Division List No. 244.)

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Considered in Committee.

Resolved, That it appears, by the Accounts laid before this House, that the total revenue of India for the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1899, was £67,595,815; that the total expenditure in India and in England charged against revenue was £64,954,942; that there was a surplus of revenue over expenditure of £2,640,873; and that the capital outlay on railways and irrigation works not charged against revenue was £3,279,316.—(*Secretary, Lord George Hamilton.*)

Resolution to be reported.

July 26.] *Page*

Intermediate Education (Ireland) Bill—Considered in Committee.

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 1 :—

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 7, to leave out 'portion of.'"—(*Mr. G. W. Balfour.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 11, to leave out from 'them' to the second 'in,' in line 12."—(*Mr. G. W. Balfour.*)

Mr. T. M. Healy (*Louth, N.*) 1439

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 14, at end, to insert, 'Nothing in any rule made in pursuance of this section shall exclude from participation in the benefits of the said Acts any school which would be entitled to participate in such benefits if this Act had not passed.'"—(*Mr. T. M. Healy.*)

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. G. W. Balfour ... 1439 *Mr. T. M. Healy* 1440

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause 1, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 2 agreed to.

Clause 3 :—

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, lines 1 and 2, to leave out the words 'out of the funds placed at their disposal grant,' and insert the words 'recommend grants of,' instead thereof."—(*Mr. T. M. Healy.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

DISCUSSION :—

The Chief Secretary for Ireland (*Mr. G. W. Balfour, Leeds, Central*) ... ... 1440 *Mr. Flynn* (*Cork, N.*) ... ... 1441 *Mr. T. M. Healy* 1441

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 73; Noes, 17. (Division List No. 245.)

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 6, after the word 'grant,' to insert the words 'with the approval of the Treasury.'"—(*Mr. T. M. Healy.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

New clause :—

"The Board under this Act shall, in addition to the members already appointed, consist of five additional members, who shall be nominated by the Lord Lieutenant."—(*Mr. T. M. Healy.*)

—brought up and read the first and second time, and added.

Bill reported, as amended; to be considered upon Monday next.

July 26.] *Page*

Naval Reserve Bill—Considered in Committee.

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. Caldwell (Lanarkshire, Mid) 1445
The First Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Goschen, St. George's, Hanover Square) 1445
The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Macartney, Antrim, S.)... 1446
Sir J. Colomb (Great Yarmouth) 1446
Mr. Caldwell 1447
The Attorney-General (Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs) ... 1447

Bill reported without Amendment; to be read the third time upon Monday next.

County Courts (Ireland) Bill [Lords]—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn... 1447

Elementary School Teachers' Superannuation (Isle of Man) Bill—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. Caldwell (Lanarkshire, Mid)... 1447
The Under Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Jesse Collings, Birmingham, Bordesley) 1447
Mr. T. M. Healy (Louth, N.) 1448

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed for Monday next.

Elementary School Teachers' Superannuation (Jersey) Bill—Read a second time, and committed for Monday next 1448

Poor Relief (Ireland) Bill—Read a second time, and committed for Monday next 1448

Local Government (Ireland) Bill—Read a second time, and committed for Monday next 1448

Local Government (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill—Read a second time, and committed for Monday next 1448

In pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th day of this instant July, Mr. Speaker adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at five minutes before Two of the clock.

LORDS.—FRIDAY, 27TH JULY, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Glyncorrwg Urban District Council Gas Bill [H.L.]- Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to 1449

London County Council (General Powers) Bill—The Queen's consent signified; and Bill reported with Amendments 1449

Mid-Kent Water Bill—Reported with Amendments... 1449

Christchurch and Bournemouth Tramways Bill — Reported with Amendments 1449

Metropolitan District Railway Bill—Reported from the Select Committee with Amendments 1449

Plymouth, Stonehouse, and Devonport Tramways Bill—Reported with Amendments 1449

Saint David's Railway (Abandonment) Bill — Reported without Amendment 1449

Bray and Enniskerry Railway Bill—Reported with Amendments ... 1449

Lancashire Electric Power Bill—Reported from the Select Committee with Amendments 1449

South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Bill—Reported from the Select Committee with Amendments 1449

London, Walthamstow, and Epping Forest Railway (Abandonment) Bill—Moved, That the Order made on the 12th day of March last, "That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after Tuesday the 26th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2ª; agreed to, and Bill read 2ª accordingly 1449

Liverpool Corporation Bill—Read 3ª, with the Amendments; a further Amendment made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons 1450

Exeter Corporation Bill—Aberdeen Police and Improvement Bill—Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons ... 1450

Wandsworth and Putney Gas Bill—Read 3ª, with the Amendments; further Amendments made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons ... 1450

West Ham Corporation Bill—Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 1450

Rickmansworth and Uxbridge Valley Water Bill—Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 1450

Great Southern and Western and Waterford, Limerick, and Western Railway Companies Amalgamation Bill [H.L.]—Moved, "That Standing Order No. 144 be dispensed with in respect of this Bill."—(*The Earl of Cork.*)

On Question, motion agreed to.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read the third time."—(*The Earl of Cork.*)

On Question, Bill read 3ª.

Moved, "That the Bill do pass."—(*The Earl of Cork.*)

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 25, pages 14 and 15, to leave out Sub-sections (6) aad (7), and to insert the following sub-sections :—

"'(6) The company shall give on application so far as they themselves are concerned through bookings with through rates and fares for traffic of every description viâ the port of Waterford to and from all places in Great Britain from or to which they can be reasonably required.

July 27.] *Page*

"'(7) The said through bookings and through rates and fares may be applied for by the Waterford Corporation or by the Waterford Commissioners or by any incorporated steamship company regularly trading with the port of Waterford or by any other person interested in such through traffic.

"'(8) The Waterford Corporation and the Waterford Commissioners shall not oppose any application to Parliament which the Great Western Railway Company may make for relief from the obligation to continue to provide or afford a daily service by steamer as provided by Section 70 of the Fishguard and Rosslare Railways and Harbours Act, 1898.'"—(*Lord Greville.*)

DISCUSSION :—

Earl Spencer ... ... 1451 *The Chairman of Committees* (*The Earl of Morley*) 1453

Amendment negatived.

Moved—

"To insert as a new clause :—'If the Treasury shall be of opinion that the company is not properly working, maintaining, and developing the traffic on or over the railways of the Waterford Company, or over any railways heretofore worked by the Waterford Company, or that the through or local rates or fares charged upon those railways are unreasonable, they may call upon the company to make such alterations in its mode of working, maintaining, and developing traffic, or in the rates or fares charged, as they may think fit, and should the company fail to make such alterations within a reasonable time after notice to it to that effect, the Treasury may prefer a complaint against the company to the Railway and Canal Commission for an order directing such alterations to be made, and thereupon the said Commission may make such order on the complaint as to them may seem fit.'"—(*Lord Greville.*)

DISCUSSION :—

Earl Spencer ... ... 1453 *The Earl of Morley* 1453

Amendment negatived.

Bill passed, and sent to the Commons.

Great Southern and Western and Waterford and Central Ireland Railway Companies Amalgamation Bill [H.L.]—Moved, "That Standing Order No. 144 be dispensed with in regard to this Bill.—(*The Earl of Cork.*)

On Question, motion agreed to.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read the third time."—(*The Earl of Cork.*)

Amendment moved—

"To leave out 'now,' and insert at the end of the motion 'this day three months.'"—(*Lord Greville.*)

Earl Spencer 1455

On Question whether "now" shall stand part of the motion, resolved in the affirmative. Bill read 3ª accordingly; Amendments made; Bill passed, and sent to the Commons.

Crystal Palace Company Bill [H.L.]; Roe's Patent Bill [H.L.]—Returned from the Commons agreed to... 1456

Barnsley Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway Bill [H.L.]; North Eastern Railway Bill [H.L.]; Ramsgate Corporation Improvements Bill [H.L.]; South Shields Corporation Bill [H.L.]—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments; the said Amendments considered, and agreed to 1456

North British Railway Bill [H.L.]—Walsall Corporation Bill [H.L.]—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments 1456

Beer Retailers' and Spirit Grocers' Licences (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill; Aberdeen Corporation Tramways Bill; Great Western Railway Bill; London and South Western Railway Bill; South Metropolitan Gas Bill—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 1456

July 27.] *Page*

Tramways Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill—House in Committee (according to Order). The Amendment proposed by the Select Committee made; further Amendment made; Standing Committee negatived; the Report of Amendments to be received on Tuesday next 1457

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill—House in Committee (according to Order). The Amendments proposed by the Select Committee made; Standing Committee negatived; the Report of Amendments to be received on Tuesday next 1457

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill—House in Committee (according to Order). Bill reported without Amendment; Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3ª on Monday next 1457

Local Government Provisional Order (No. 15) Bill—House in Committee (according to Order). Amendments made; Standing Committee negatived; the Report of Amendments to be received on Monday next 1458

Paisley Waterworks Provisional Order Confirmation Bill; Edinburgh (Housing of the Working Classes) Improvement Scheme Provisional Order Bill—House in Committee (according to Orders). Bills reported without Amendment; Standing Committee negatived; and Bills to be read 3ª on Tuesday next 1458

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill—Read 3ª, (according to Order), with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 1458

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 14) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill; Perth and Paisley Gas Provisional Orders Bill; Read 3ª (according to Order), and passed 1458

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

MUNICIPAL TRADING—Report from the Joint Committee (with the Proceedings of the Committee) made, and to be printed. (No. 210) 1458

NATIONAL EDUCATION (IRELAND)—I. Annual Report of the Commissioners, for the year 1899–1900. II. Appendices (Sections i., ii., iii., and iv.) ... 1458

CHINA, No. 3 (1900)—Correspondence respecting the insurrectionary movement in China 1458

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES)—No. 2488, Guatemala; No. 2490, Sweden (Gothenburg). Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie upon the Table 1458

INEBRIATE RETREATS (RULES AS TO MANAGEMENT)—Regulations made with the approval of the Secretary of State for the Home Department for the domestic management of the Corngreaves Hall Retreat, licensed as a Retreat under the Inebriates Acts 1879 to 1899 1458

IRISH LAND COMMISSION (PURCHASE OF LAND (IRELAND) ACT, 1891)—Return of Advances under the Act during the year ended the 31st March, 1900. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 1458

LONDON CORPORATION—Annual Account of the Chamberlain of London. Delivered (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 1458

July 27.] *Page*

STRENGTH AND ORGANISATION OF HOME DEFENCES.

DISCUSSION :—

The Earl of Wemyss ... 1458
The Prime Minister and Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (The Marquess of Salisbury) ... 1463
The Earl of Rosebery 1468
The Secretary of State for War (The Marquess of Lansdowne) 1472
The Earl of Kimberley 1475

Post Office Sites Bill—[SECOND READING]—Order of the Day for the Second Reading Read.

Moved, "That the Bill be read a second time."—(*The Marquess of Londonderry.*)

On Question, agreed to. Bill read 2ª accordingly, and committed for Monday next.

Agricultural Holdings Bill—House in Committee (according to Order).

Clause 1 :—

Moved—

"In page 1, line 12, to add the following proviso :—'Provided always, that in estimating the value of any improvement in Schedule I., there shall not be taken into account, as part of the improvement made by the tenant, what is justly due to the inherent capabilities of the soil.'"—(*Earl Grey.*)

DISCUSSION :—

Viscount Cross 1481
The Earl of Camperdown ... 1483
The Earl of Kimberley ... 1484
The Duke of Northumberland ... 1485
The Duke of Devonshire... ... 1485

On Question, "That those words be there inserted," their Lordships divided :—Contents, 50 ; Not-Contents, 5.

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 27, after 'endured' insert 'not exceeding the value of the manure which would have been produced by the consumption on the holding of the crops so sold off or removed.'"—(*The Lord Privy Seal.*)

The Earl of Camperdown 1487

On Question, "That those words be there inserted," agreed to.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 2 :—

Drafting Amendments made.

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 40, after 'claim' to insert a new sub-section : 'Every claim and written notice under this section shall state, as far as reasonably may be, the particulars and amount of the intended claim.'"—(*The Earl of Camperdown.*)

Viscount Cross 1488

Amendment negatived.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 3, 4, and 5 agreed to.

Clause 6 :—

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out Clause 6."—(*The Duke of Northumberland.*)

[July 27.] Page

DISCUSSION :—
Viscount Cross ... ... 1489 *Lord Balfour of Burleigh* ... 1490
The Duke of Northumberland 1490

Amendment negatived.

Clauses 6, 7, 8, and 9 agreed to.

Clause 10 :—

Amendment moved—

"In page 5, at end of clause to insert : '(5) Where any jurisdiction committed by the principal Act or this Act to the sheriff is exercised by the sheriff-substitute there shall be no appeal to the sheriff.'"—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Remaining clauses agreed to.

First Schedule :—

Amendment moved—

"In page 6, line 8, to omit the words 'exceeding one acre.'"—(*Lord Windsor.*)

DISCUSSION :—
Viscount Cross ... ... 1492 *Lord Heneage* 1494
The Earl of Feversham ... 1494

On Question, whether the words proposed to be left out shall stand part of the schedule, their Lordships divided :—Contents, 15 ; Not-Contents, 25.
Schedule, as amended, agreed to.
Second and third schedules amended and agreed to.

Bill re-committed to the Standing Committee, and to be printed as amended. (No. 211.)

House adjourned during pleasure ; and resumed by the Earl of Morley.

Tithe Rent-Charge Ireland Bill—Read 3ª (according to Order), with the Amendments ; further Amendments made ; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons 1495

Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill—Read 3ª (according to Order), with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 1495

Oil in Tobacco Bill—House in Committee (according to Order) ; an Amendment made ; Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendment to be received on Monday next 1495

House adjourned at five minutes past Eight of the clock.

COMMONS: FRIDAY, 27TH JULY, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Aberdeen Corporation Tramways Bill ; Great Western Railway Bill ; London and South Western Railway Bill ; South Metropolitan Gas Bill—Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to 1495

Crystal Palace Company Bill [Lords] ; Roe's Patent Bill [Lords]—Read the third time, and passed, without amendment 1496

July 27.] *Page*

South Shields Corporation Bill [Lords]—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 1496

Walsall Corporation Bill [Lords]—As amended, considered. Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)
Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed, with Amendments ... 1496

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [Lords]—Reported without amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. Bill to be considered on Monday next 1496

Caledonian Railway Bill [Lords]; Morley Corporation Bill [Lords]; Bournemouth Corporation Bill [Lords]; Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 1496

Manchester Corporation Tramways Bill [Lords] — Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 1496

Message From the Lords—That they have agreed to—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill, Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 14) Bill, Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill, Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill, Perth and Paisley Gas Provisional Orders Bill, without amendment.

That they have agreed to—Bradford Corporation Bill, Halifax Corporation Bill, Oldham Corporation Bill, Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill, City of London (Various Powers) Bill, Market Weighton Drainage and Navigation Bill, Cumberland County Council (Bridges) Bill, Charing Cross and Strand Electricity Supply Bill, Croydon Tramways and Improvements Bill, with Amendments.

That they have agreed to Amendments to—London Sea Water Supply Bill [Lords], Glasgow Building Regulations Bill [Lords], Motherwell and Bellshill Railway Bill [Lords], North Eastern Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill [Lords], Rotherham Corporation Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill intituled, "An Act for amalgamating the Waterford, Limerick, and Western Railway Company with the Great Southern and Western Railway Company; and for other purposes." Great Southern and Western and Waterford, Limerick, and Western Railway Companies Amalgamation Bill [Lords].

And also a Bill intituled, "An Act for amalgamating the Undertaking of the Waterford and Central Ireland Railway Company with the Great Southern and Western Railway Company; and for other purposes." Great Southern and Western and Waterford and Central Ireland Railway Companies Amalgamation Bill [Lords] 1496

Great Southern and Western and Waterford, Limerick, and Western Railway Companies Amalgamation Bill [Lords]; Great Southern and Western and Waterford and Central Ireland Railway Companies Amalgamation Bill [Lords] — Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills 1497

PETITIONS.

Education (Scotland) Bill—Petition from Whithorn, against; to lie upon the Table 1497

Evening Continuation Schools—Petition of the School Board for London, for greater facilities for the attendance of young people; to lie upon the Table 1497

Industrial Schools Bill—Petitions from Leith, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1497

Page

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

INEBRIATES' RETREATS (RULES FOR MANAGEMENT)—Copy presented, of Regulations, made with the approval of the Secretary of State for the Home Department, for the Domestic Management of Corngreaves Hall Retreat, licensed as a Retreat under the Inebriates Acts, 1869 to 1899 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 1498

IRISH LAND COMMISSION (PURCHASE OF LAND (IRELAND) ACT, 1891)—Copy presented, of Return of Advances under the Act during the year ended 31st March, 1900 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [302.] 1498

CHINA (No. 3, 1900)—Copy presented, of Correspondence respecting the Insurrectionary Movement in China [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1498

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES)—Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 2488 to 2490 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1498

PAPERS LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE—1. Chamber of London.—Annual Accounts of the Chamberlain of London for the year 1899 [by Act]; to be printed. [No. 303.]

2. Royal University of Ireland.—Copy of Account of Receipts and Expenditure of the Royal University of Ireland for the year ended 31st March, 1900, together with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon [by Act]; to be printed. [No. 304] 1498

QUESTIONS.

CHINA — ANTI-FOREIGN OUTBREAK — RECENT NEWS — ADVANCE OF THE ALLIES ON PEKING—Question, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs); Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) 1498

CHINESE EMBASSY IN LONDON — Question, Mr. Warner (Staffordshire, Lichfield); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1499

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL ARRANGEMENTS INQUIRY—Question, Sir Walter Foster (Derbyshire, Ilkeston); Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.)... 1499

KOORNSPRUIT DISASTER — Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1500

RESUMPTION OF INDUSTRIAL OCCUPATIONS AT JOHANNESBURG — Question, Mr. Kimber (Wandsworth); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. J. Chamberlain, Birmingham, W.) 1500

MARTIAL LAW IN CAPE COLONY AND RHODESIA—Question, Capt. Sinclair (Forfarshire); Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain 1501

LINDLEY DISASTER—Question, Mr. Kimber; Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for War (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 1501

BRITISH CASUALTIES IN JUNE—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1501

BRITISH MEDICAL COMFORTS FOR THE BOERS—TREATMENT OF BRITISH PRISONERS—Question, Mr. Kimber; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1502

July 27.] *Page*

ARMY MEDICAL DEPARTMENT—CIVIL SURGEONS—SUPPOSED PLEDGE OF SECRECY—Question, Dr. Tanner (County Cork, Mid); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1502

RETIRED ARMY MEDICAL OFFICERS RECALLED TO ACTIVE SERVICE—Question, Dr. Tanner; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1503

COMMAND OF THE ROYAL IRISH RIFLES—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1503

BRITISH REVERSES—COURTS OF INQUIRY—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1504

IMPERIAL YEOMANRY ENCAMPMENT NEAR BEIRA—Question, Sir J. Fergusson (Manchester, N.E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1504

GRATUITIES TO VOLUNTEER OFFICERS SERVING IN SOUTH AFRICA—Question, Mr. J. A. Pease (Northumberland, Tyneside); Answer, Mr. Wyndham ... 1505

VOLUNTEERS—EYPLOYMENT ON FOREIGN SERVICE—Question, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1505

GIBRALTAR GARRISON—OFFICERS' HOUSES—Question, Mr. Pierpoint (Warrington); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1506

ARMY PROMOTION BOARD—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1506

GUN FATALITY AT CAMDEN FORT, CORK—Question, Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1507

MILITIA OFFICERS' PAY—Question, Major Rasch (Essex, S.E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1507

GREAT YARMOUTH FISHERMEN AND THE MILITIA—Question, Sir J. Colomb (Great Yarmouth); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1507

MILITIA SERGEANT-MAJORS—Question, Major Rasch; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1508

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS—IRISH TENDERERS—Question, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the War Office (Mr. J. Powell-Williams, Birmingham, S.) 1508

THE "VICTORIA AND ALBERT"—Questions, Sir Edward Gourley (Sunderland) and Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answers, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Goschen, St. George's, Hanover Square) 1509

THE BELLEVILLE BOILER INQUIRY—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answer, Mr. Goschen 1510

ROMAN CATHOLIC CHAPLAINS IN THE NAVY—Question, Capt. Donelan (Cork, E.); Answer, Mr. Goschen 1510

TORPEDO BOATS AT THE NAVAL MANŒUVRES—Question, Sir Edward Gourley; Answer, Mr. Goschen 1510

NATIONAL COAL RESERVE—Question, Sir Howard Vincent; Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Ritchie, Croydon) 1511

July 27.] *Page*

IMPORTATION OF DOGS INTO GREAT BRITAIN—Question, Mr. Channing (Northamptonshire, E.); Answer, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Akers Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) 1512

PALACE OF WESTMINSTER—VENTILATION OF COMMITTEE ROOMS—Question, Mr. Talbot (Oxford University); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 1513

KENSINGTON GARDENS REGULATIONS—Question, Earl Percy (Kensington, S.); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 1513

HOVE RECREATION GROUND—Question, Sir Henry Fletcher (Sussex, Lewes); Answer, The Secretary to the Local Government Board (Mr. T. W. Russell, Tyrone, S.) 1514

LOCAL TAXATION RETURNS—Question, Mr. Channing; Answer, Mr. T. W. Russell... 1514

NEW SCIENCE AND ART REGULATIONS—Questions, Mr. Harwood (Bolton), and Mr. J. A. Pease; Answers, The Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education (Sir J. Gorst, Cambridge University) 1515

LONDON SCHOOL BOARD—HIGHER ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS—Question, Mr. Lough (Islington, W.); Answer, Sir J. Gorst 1516

FOOD PRESERVATIVES—Question, Mr. Lambert (Devonshire, South Molton); Answer, The Attorney-General (Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs)... 1517

RURAL POSTMEN'S SHELTERS—Question, Mr. Steadman (Tower Hamlets, Stepney); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Hanbury, Preston) 1518

POSTMEN'S UNIFORMS—Question, Dr. Tanner; Answer, Mr. Hanbury ... 1518

TRADE MARKS—FOREIGN OFFICE—Question, Sir Howard Vincent; Answer, Mr. Hanbury 1518

CIVIL SERVICE ABSTRACTORS—TERMS OF SERVICE—Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde (Kerry, W.); Answer, Mr. Hanbury 1519

COUNTY COURT FEES—Question, Sir Chas. Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, Mr. Hanbury 1519

IRISH LUNATIC ASYLUMS BOARD—SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE—Question, Mr. T. M. Healy (Louth, N.); Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Sir M. Hicks Beach, Bristol, W.) 1520

DERRY MAGISTRACY—Question, Mr. Arthur J. Moore (Londonderry); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. G. W. Balfour, Leeds, Central) ... 1520

GRANTS IN AID TO IRISH ASYLUMS—Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde; Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour 1521

GRANTS FOR MALICIOUS INJURIES IN IRELAND—Question, Mr. T. M. Healy; Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour 1521

CORK LAND COMMISSION—Question, Dr. Tanner; Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour 1522

MUZZLING REGULATIONS IN CORK—Question, Mr. Maurice Healy (Cork); Answer, The Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture for Ireland (Mr. Plunkett, Dublin County, S.) ... ...

NEWBLISS POST OFFICE—DELIVERY OF TELEGRAMS BY GIRLS—Question, Mr. Macaleese (Monaghan, N.); Answer, Mr. Hanbury... 1523

LIMAVADY POSTMASTERSHIP—Questions, Mr. Arthur J. Moore and Mr. T. M. Healy; Answer, Mr. Hanbury 1523

IRISH NATIONAL TEACHERS' ARREARS OF FEE GRANTS—Question, Capt. Donelan; Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour 1523

INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION BOARD CLERKS—Question, T. M. Healy; Answer, Mr. G. W. Balfour 1524

PUBLIC BUSINESS.

Beer Retailers' and Spirit Grocers' Licences (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill – Lords Amendments to be considered forthwith; considered, and agreed to 1524

MUNICIPAL TRADING (JOINT COMMITTEE)—Report from the Select Committee appointed to join with a Committee of the Lords on Municipal Trading, with Minutes of Evidence and an Appendix, brought up, and read [Inquiry not completed]. Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 305] 1524

NAVY AND ARMY EXPENDITURE, 1898–99—Committee to consider the Savings and Deficiencies upon Navy and Army Grants for 1898–99, and the temporary sanction obtained from the Treasury by the Navy and Army Departments to the Expenditure not provided for in the Grants for that year, upon Monday next 1524

Ordered, That the Appropriation Accounts for the Navy and Army Departments, which were presented upon the 15th day of February last, be referred to the Committee.—(*Mr. Hanbury.*)

Intermediate Education (Ireland) Bill—As amended, in the Committee, to be printed. [Bill 315.]

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS—That they have agreed to—County and Borough Franchise Assimilation (London) Bill, without amendment.

That they have agreed to—Merchant Shipping (Liability of Shipowners and Others) Bill, with an Amendment.

That they have agreed to—Cruelty to Wild Animals in Captivity Bill, with Amendment.

SUPPLY [21ST ALLOTTED DAY].—Considered in Committee.

[MR. J. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

ARMY (SUPPLEMENTARY) ESTIMATE, 1900-1901—Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a supplementary sum, not exceeding £11,500,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for Additional Expenditure, mainly due to the war in South Africa and to affairs in China, in respect of the following Army Services, viz.:—

Vote 1.—Pay, etc., of the Army	3,250,000
Vote 2.—Medical Establishment: Pay, etc.	350,000
Vote 5.—Volunteer Corps: Pay and Allowances	500,000
Vote 6.—Transport and Remounts	4,500,000
Vote 7.—Provisions, Forage, and other supplies	850,000
Vote 8.—Clothing Establishments and Services	100,000
Vote 9.—Warlike and other Stores	500,000
Vote 10.—Works, etc.: Cost (including Staff for Engineer Services)	1,060,000
Vote 12.—Miscellaneous Effective Services	140,000
Vote 14.—Non-Effective Services, Officers	250,000
Total	£11,500,000."

DISCUSSION :—

The Under-Secretary of State for War (*Mr. Wyndham, Dover*) 1526
Sir Chas. Dilke (*Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean*) ... 1538
Major Rasch (*Essex, S.E.*) 1549
Sir John Colomb (*Great Yarmouth*) 1552
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (*Stirling Burghs*) ... 1555
Mr. Arnold-Forster (*Belfast, W.*) 1558
Sir Walter Foster (*Derbyshire, Ilkeston*) 1564
Mr. Burdett-Coutts (*Westminster*) 1568
Sir Howard Vincent (*Sheffield, Central*) 1572
Mr. Wason (*Clackmannan and Kinross*) 1577
Sir J. Fergusson (*Manchester, N.E.*) 1578
Dr. Farquharson (*Aberdeenshire, W.*) 1581
Colonel Blundell (*Lancashire, Ince*) 1582

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a reduced sum, not exceeding £11,499,900, be granted for the said Service."—(*Mr. Courtenay Warner.*)

DISCUSSION :—

Mr. Bartley (*Islington, N.*) 1589
Capt. Sinclair (*Forfarshire*) 1590
Mr. Seely (*Lincoln*) ... 1598
Mr. Joseph Walton (*Yorkshire W.R., Barnsley*) ... 1599
Col. Welby (*Taunton*) ... 1601
Mr. Dalziel (*Kirkcaldy Burghs*) 1604
Mr. Kimber (*Wandsworth*) ... 1609
Mr. Edmund Robertson (*Dundee*) 1610
Mr. Wyndham 1615
Mr. Warner (*Staffordshire, Lichfield*) 1627

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Original Question again proposed.

Mr. Bryn Roberts (*Carnarvonshire, Eifion*) ... 1628
Mr. Swift MacNeill (*Donegal, S.*) 1628

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a reduced sum, not exceed-£3,500,000, be granted for the said Service."—(*Mr. T. M. Healy.*)

Mr. Tully (*Leitrim, S.*) 1638

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 12; Noes, 87. (Division List No. 246.)

Original Question put, and agreed to.

Resolution to be reported upon Monday next; Committee to sit again upon Monday next.

In pursuance of the Order of the House on the 16th day of this instant July, Mr. Speaker adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at half after One of the clock.

END OF CONTENTS OF VOL. LXXXVI.

PUBLIC BILLS

DEALT WITH IN VOLUME LXXXVI.

Those marked thus * are Government Bills. The figures in parentheses in the last column refer to the page in this volume. "[H.L.]" following title indicates that the Bill was originated in the Lords.

(A.) HOUSE OF LORDS.

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
*Agricultural Holdings	*Viscount Cross*	Read 1ª 20 July (589); Read 2ª 24 July (989); Committee, 27 July (1479)
Beer Retailers' and Spirit Grocers' Licences (Ireland) (No. 2).	———	Report 23 July (837); Read 3ª 24 July (1010)
*Charitable Loans (Ireland)	———	Read 3ª 19 July (420)
Copyright [H.L.]	*Lord Monkswell*	Committee, 23 July (837)
County and Borough Franchise Assimilation (London)	*Lord Farquhar*	Read 2ª 17 July (193); Committee, Report, 20 July (589); Read 3ª 26 July (1275)
*County Courts Ireland [H.L.]	*Lord Ashbourne*	Committee, Report, 16 July (39); Read 3ª 19 July (420)
Cruelty to Wild Animals in Captivity	———	Report 24 July (989); Read 3ª 26 July (1284)
Diocesan Registration [H.L.]	*Archbishop of Canterbury*	Report 19 July (420); Read 3ª 20 July (619)
*Education [H.L.]	*Duke of Devonshire*	Read 2ª 23 July (796); Committee, 24 July (1010)
Executors (Scotland)	———	Read 2ª 20 July (618)
*Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment	———	Read 2ª 20 June (621); Committee, 23 July (842); Report, 26 July (1283); Read 3ª 27 July (1495)
*Inebriates' Amendment (Scotland) [H.L.]	*Lord Balfour of Burleigh*	Commons Amendments considered, 24 July (1010)
*Land Charges [H.L.]	*Earl of Halsbury*	Commons Amendments considered, 19 July (435)
*Lunacy Board (Scotland), Salaries, etc.	*Lord Balfour of Burleigh*	Read 1ª 20 July (589); Read 2ª 24 July (1010); Committee, Report, 26 July (1284)
Members of Local Authorities Relief [H.L.]	*Duke of Northumberland*	Committee, 16 July (36); Report, 19 July (420); Read 3ª 20 July (621)
Merchant Shipping (Liability of Shipowners and others)	———	Report, 19 July (420); Third Reading (adjourned) 20 July (619); Read 3ª 26 July (1269)
*Oil in Tobacco	———	Read 1ª 20 July (589); Read 2ª 26 July (1285); Committee, 27 July (1495)

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
*Poor Removal	———	Read 3ª 19 July (415)
*Post Office Sites	———	Read 1ª 20 July (589); Read 2ª 27 July (1478)
*Prohibition of Exportation of Arms [H.L.]	*Earl of Halsbury*	Read 1ª 20 July (635); Read 2ª 23 July (842); Committee, Report, 24 July (1010); Read 3ª 26 July (1285)
*Tithe Rent Charge (Ireland)	*Lord Ashbourne*	Read 1ª 17 July (193); Read 2ª 19 July (420); Committee, 23 July (840); Report, 26 July (1275); Read 3ª 27 July (1495)
Town Councils (Scotland)	———	Committee, 20 July (589); Report, 26 July (1275)
Veterinary Surgeons Amendment	———	Committee, Report, 16 July (40); Read 3ª 19 July (420)
Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension	———	Read 3ª 16 July (37)

(B.) HOUSE OF COMMONS.

No.	Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
121, 258, 293	*Agricultural Holdings	*Mr. Long*	Read 3° 19 July (532)
28	Beer Retailers' and Spirit Grocers' Licences (Ireland) (No. 2)	*Mr. Wm. Moore*	Lords Amendments considered 27 July (1524)
46, 237	Borough Funds	*Sir Albert Rollit*	Withdrawn 20 July (672)
300	*Colonial Stock [H.L.]	*Sir R. Finlay*	Read 1° 17 July (240); Read 2° 23 July (969)
79, 304	*Companies	*Mr. Ritchie*	Consideration, 24 July (1065)
51	Compensation for Damage to Crops	*Mr. Jeffreys*	Withdrawn 17 July (240)
216	*County Courts (Investment of Deposits) [H.L.]	*Sir R. Finlay*	Committee, Report, 18 July (402); Consideration, Third Reading, 19 July (583)
310	*County Courts (Ireland) [H.L.]	*Mr. Atkinson*	Read 1° 23 July (889); Bill withdrawn, 26 July (1447)
290	*Diocesan Records [H.L.]	*Sir M. White Ridley*	Withdrawn 19 July (584)

No.	Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
125	*Dogs Regulation	*Mr. Long*	Withdrawn 16 July (187)
244	*Education (Scotland) [H.L.]	*Mr. A. Graham Murray*	Withdrawn 16 July (187)
305	*Elementary School Teachers' Superannuation (Isle of Man)	*Mr. Jesse Collings*	Read 1° 19 July (487); Read 2° 26 July (1447)
306	*Elementary School Teachers' Superannuation (Jersey)	*Mr. Jesse Collings*	Read 1° 19 July (487); Read 2° 26 July (1448)
311	*Expiring Laws Continuance	*Mr. Hanbury*	———
111	*Factories and Workshops	*Sir M. White Ridley*	Withdrawn 16 July (187)
142	Factory and Workshop Act (1878) Amendment (No. 2)	*Mr. Harwood*	Withdrawn 18 July (344)
82	Highways and Bridges Act (1891) Amendment	*Mr. Jeffreys*	Withdrawn 23 July (888)
301	*Imitation of County Court Process [H.L.]	*Sir Robert Finlay*	Read 1° 17 July (240); Read 2° 23 July (975)
149	*Inebriates Amendment (Scotland) [H.L.]	*Mr. A. Graham Murray*	Read 2° 18 July (403); Committee, Report, Consideration, Third Reading, 19 July (584)
210 315	Intermediate Education (Ireland)	*Mr. G. W. Balfour*	Second Reading 19 July (487); Committee, 26 July (1438)
209	*Irish Education Bill	*Mr. G. W. Balfour*	Second Reading (Bill withdrawn), 19 July (526)
63	Liquor Traffic Local Veto (Scotland)	*Mr. John Wilson (Govan)*	Withdrawn 23 July (888)
302	Local Government Act (1888) Amendment (London)	*Mr. H. Robertson*	Read 1° 17 July (241)
259	*Local Government (Ireland)	*Mr. G. W. Balfour*	Read 2° 26 July (1448)
260	*Local Government (Ireland) (No. 2)	*Mr. G. W. Balfour*	Read 2° 26 July (1448)
119	*Lunacy [H.L.]	*Sir R. Webster*	Withdrawn 16 July (188)
140	*Lunacy Board (Scotland) Salaries, &c.	*Mr. A. Graham Murray*	Committee, Report, 18 July (402); Consideration, Third Reading, 19 July (583)
307	Medical Act (1858) Extension	*General Laurie*	Read 1° 20 July (672)
313	Members of Local Authorities Relief [H.L.]	*Mr. Wilson Todd*	Read 1° 26 July (1345)
285	*Military Lands [H.L.]	*Mr. Wyndham*	Read 2° 23 July (890)
275	*Military Manœuvres [H.L.]	*Mr. Wyndham*	Withdrawn 16 July (188)
303	*Naval Reserve	*Mr. Macartney*	Read 1° 17 July (241); Read 2° 23 July (966); Committee, 26 July (1445)

No.	Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
298	*Oil in Tobacco	*Sir M. Hicks Beach*	Read 2° 18 July (402); Committee, Report, Third Reading, 19 July (583)
157	*Palatine Court of Durham [H.L.]	*Sir R. Webster*	Withdrawn 16 July (188)
261	*Poor Relief (Ireland)	*Mr. G. W. Balfour*	Read 2° 26 July (1448)
228, 274	*Post Office Sites	*Mr. Hanbury*	Committee, Report, 18 July (387); Read 3° 19 July (582)
314	*Probibition of Exportation of Arms [H.L.]	*Sir Robert Finlay*	Read 1° 26 July (1345)
280	*Public Works Loans	*Mr. Hanbury*	Committee, Report, 23 July (979)
25, 220	Quarries	*Mr. Alfred Pease*	Withdrawn 26 July (1345)
308	Railway and Canal Traffic Acts Amendment	*Sir T. Gibson-Carmichael*	Read 1° 20 July (673)
78, 198, 246	*Railways (Prevention of Accidents)	*Mr. Ritchie*	Lords Amendments, considered, 19 July (584)
139	*Reformatory and Industrial Schools (Scotland)	*Mr. Jesse Collings*	Withdrawn 16 July (188)
276	*Reserve Forces [H.L.]	*Mr. Wyndham*	Read 2° 18 July (385); Committee, Report, 23 July (965); Consideration, Third Reading, 25 July (1162)
212	*Savings Banks and Friendly Societies	*Sir M. Hicks Beach*	Withdrawn 16 July (187)
309	Teachers of Music Registration	*Mr. Sidebotham*	Read 1° 20 July (673)
97	*Tithe Rent-charge (Ireland)	*Mr. Atkinson*	Re-committal, Third Reading, 16 July (117)
286	*Volunteers [H.L.]	*Mr. Wyndham*	Read 2° 18 July (344); Committee, Report, 23 July (925)
14, 165, 257	Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension	*Mr. H. S. Foster*	Lords Amendments considered, 17 July (240)
189	*Youthful Offenders [H.L.]	*Sir M. White Ridley*	Withdrawn 16 July (187)

THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(*AUTHORISED EDITION*)

IN THE

SEVENTH SESSION OF THE *TWENTY-SIXTH PARLIAMENT* OF THE UNITED KINGDOM OF *GREAT BRITAIN* AND *IRELAND*, APPOINTED TO MEET THE 30TH JANUARY 1900, IN THE 63RD YEAR OF THE REIGN OF

HER MAJESTY QUEEN VICTORIA.

NINTH VOLUME OF SESSION 1900.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Monday, 16th July, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with :—

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 12).
Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 14).
Coventry Corporation.
Shannon Water and Electric Power.
Hastings Corporation.
Alexandra Park.
Great Indian Peninsula Railway Company.
Southport Corporation.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

BAKER STREET AND WATERLOO RAILWAY BILL.

Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

SOUTH METROPOLITAN GAS BILL.

Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

PORTLAND URBAN DISTRICT GAS BILL.

SUNDERLAND CORPORATION BILL [H.L.].

Reported with Amendments.

TOTTENHAM URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL BILL.

Moved, That the Order made on the 12th day of March last, "That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after Tuesday, the 26th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2ª ; agreed to ; Bill read 2ª accordingly, and committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

FRASER SETTLED CHATTELS BILL [H.L.].

Read 3ª, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

JARROW AND HEBBURN ELECTRICITY SUPPLY BILL.

HASTINGS TRAMWAYS BILL.

Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

BELFAST AND COUNTY DOWN RAILWAY BILL.

Read 3ª, with the Amendment, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

DURHAM (COUNTY OF) ELECTRIC POWER SUPPLY BILL.

LANCASHIRE ELECTRIC POWER BILL.

Brought from the Commons; read 1ª, and referred to the Examiners.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 6) BILL [H.L.].

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 8) BILL [H.L.].

Returned from the Commons agreed to.

GREAT EASTERN RAILWAY BILL.

LONDON AND ST. KATHERINE DOCKS AND EAST AND WEST INDIA DOCK COMPANIES BILL.

ST ALBANS WATER BILL.

Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

DONEGAL RAILWAY BILL [H.L.].

GREAT SOUTHERN AND WESTERN RAILWAY BILL [H.L.].

Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments: The said Amendments considered, and agreed to.

SOUTH STAFFORDSHIRE TRAMWAYS BILL [H.L.].

Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments.

GAS PROVISIONAL ORDER (No. 3) BILL [H.L.].

Returned from the Commons with the Amendment agreed to.

EAST LONDON WATER BILL.

ROCHDALE CORPORATION BILL.

EAST HAM CORPORATION BILL.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 10) BILL.

PLYMOUTH, STONEHOUSE, AND DEVONPORT TRAMWAYS BILL.

CROYDON TRAMWAYS AND IMPROVEMENTS BILL.

LONDON COUNTY TRAMWAYS (No. 1) BILL.

LONDON COUNTY TRAMWAYS (No. 2) BILL.

KINGSCOURT, KEADY, AND ARMAGH RAILWAY BILL.

NEWRY, KEADY, AND TYNAN LIGHT RAILWAY BILL.

GREAT NORTHERN RAILWAY BILL.

Report from the Committee of Selection, That the following Lords be proposed to the House to form the Select Committee for the consideration of the said Bills, viz.:—

M. Bath,
E. Camperdown (chairman),
L. de Ramsey,
L. Monkbretton,
L. Stanmore;

agreed to; and the said Lords appointed accordingly. The Committee to meet on Wednesday next, at Eleven o'clock; and all petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Bills to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Bills.

PERTH AND PAISLEY GAS PROVISIONAL ORDERS BILL.

Moved, That the Order made on the 12th day of March last, "That no Provisional Order Confirmation Bill brought before the House of Commons shall be read a second time after Tuesday the 26th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read a second time; agreed to. Bill read 2ª accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

TRAMWAYS PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 5) BILL.

Moved, That the Order of the 12th of March last, "That no Provisional Order Confirmation Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after Tuesday the 26th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read a second time; agreed to; Bill read 2ª accordingly, and committed, The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 1) BILL.

House in Committee (according to Order). Amendments made; Standing Committee negatived; the Report of Amendments to be received To-morrow.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 5) BILL.

House in Committee (according to Order). Bill reported without amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 12) BILL.

Amendments reported (according to Order), and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 8) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (POOR LAW) BILL.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 9) BILL.

House in Committee (according to Order). Bills reported without Amendment; Standing Committee negatived; and Bills to be read 3ª To-morrow.

PIER AND HARBOUR PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 2) BILL.

House in Committee (according to Order). Amendments made; Standing Committee negatived; the Report of Amendments to be received To-morrow.

LONDON (ST. MARYLEBONE) PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners. (No. 188.)

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS BILL — SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS.

LORD HARRIS: My Lords, in moving that the Standing Orders be dispensed with in regard to these nine Provisional Order Bills, I would point out that the delay in the introduction of the Bills has not been due to the Local Government Board. There was some delay by the printer, which, added to the abnormal length of the Whitsuntide recess and the fact that there was some opposition in the House of Commons, accounts for the late period at which the Bills come up to your Lordships; but I understand that the Chairman of Committees has no objection to the Standing Orders being suspended.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 7) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 9) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 10) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 11) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 12) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 13) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 14) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 15) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDER (HOUSING OF WORKING CLASSES) BILL.

Moved—"That the Order of the 12th of March last, 'That no Provisional Order Confirmation Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after Tuesday the 26th day of June next,' be dispensed with, and that the Bills be now read a second time."—(*Lord Harris.*)

THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (The Earl of MORLEY): There have been a great many Bills this year—a larger number than I ever remember in any previous session — in connection with which this Standing Order has been dispensed with. I quite admit that the delay is not so much the fault of the Local Government Board, but I must warn my noble friend that if there is any opposition I cannot undertake to have the Bills referred to Select Committees. There are a number of unopposed Bills yet to be dealt with.

On Question, agreed to; Bills read 2ª accordingly.

THE EARL OF DENBIGH: I have an exactly similar motion to move in connection with four Irish Bills, and I hope the noble Earl the Chairman of Committees will raise no objection.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 3) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 4) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDERS (HOUSING OF WORKING CLASSES) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDERS (HOUSING OF WORKING CLASSES) (No. 2) BILL.

Moved—"That the Order of the 12th of March last, 'That no Provisional Order Confirmation Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after Tuesday the 26th day of June next,' be dispensed with, and that the Bills be now read a second time."—(*The Earl of Denbigh.*)

THE EARL OF MORLEY: I must give the same answer to the noble Earl. If the Bills are unopposed I shall make no

objection, but if they are opposed I cannot undertake to have them considered.

On Question, agreed to. Bills read 2ª accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Thursday next.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 7) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 9) BILL.

Committed. The Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 10) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No 11) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 13) BILL.

Committed to a Committee of the whole House To-morrow.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 15) BILL.

Committed to a Committee of the whole House.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDER (HOUSING OF WORKING CLASSES) BILL.

Committed to a Committee of the whole House To-morrow.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

NAVY (COURTS-MARTIAL).

Returns of the number of courts-martial held and summary punishments inflicted on seamen of the Royal Navy, etc., during the year 1899.

SOUTH AFRICA.

Further correspondence relating to affairs in South Africa (in continuation of [Cd. 43], January 1900).

RAILWAY RETURNS.

Return as to the capital, traffic, receipts, and working expenditure, etc., of the railway companies of the United Kingdom, for the year 1899.

INDIA (ACCOUNTS AND ESTIMATES, 1900–1901).

Explanatory memorandum by the Secretary of State for India.

MINT.

Thirtieth Annual Report of the Deputy Master and Comptroller of the Mint, for 1900.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

PUBLIC WORKS LOAN BOARD.

Twenty-fifth Annual Report, 1898–99; with appendices.

SUPERANNUATION.

Treasury Minute, dated 6th July, 1900, granting a retired allowance to Mr. T. G. Pinches, first class assistant at the British Museum, under Section 2 of the Superannuation Act, 1887.

MERCHANT SEAMEN'S FUND.

Account of the receipt and expenditure under the Seamen's Fund Winding-up Act, from 1st January to 31st December, 1899.

TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION ACT, 1889.

Minute of the Board of Education sanctioning the subjects to be taught under Clause 8 of the Technical Instruction Act, 1889, for the county borough of Oldham, seventh minute.

POLLING DISTRICTS (YORKSHIRE, WEST RIDING).

Order made by the County Council of the West Riding of Yorkshire constituting polling districts and polling places in the Parliamentary Divisions of Shipley, Sowerby, and Colne Valley.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

QUEEN ANNE'S BOUNTY BOARD.

Report from the Joint Committee (with the proceedings of the Committee) made, and to be printed. (No. 186.)

HOME DEFENCE — MILITARY RESOURCES.

THE EARL OF WEMYSS: My Lords, I beg to give notice that on Friday week

I shall ask the Prime Minister the following questions—

"(1) Whether he or his colleagues have ever received information of expressions of opinion, from reliable sources, confirming the view of one of our Foreign Military Attachés, recently quoted in debate, to the effect that 'It is all-important that England should be strong and unassailable in the month of November next.'

"(2) Whether he is of opinion that the European situation is now less alarming than it seemed to him on the 9th of May last, when he spoke to the Primrose League as follows:—'It is not necessarily because in themselves they are more important, but if you look around you will see that the elements and causes of menace and peril are, though slowly, accumulating, and may accumulate to such a point as to require our most earnest and active effort to repel them.'

"(3) Whether, as Prime Minister, responsible for our national safety, he has carefully inquired into our home land defensive means and organisation, and has satisfied himself that these are such as, failing the fleet, will render all attempts at invasion by any hostile nation futile and impossible of success.

"(4) Whether, if not satisfied as to the sufficiency and organisation of our home land defences, he will cause such measures to be taken as will give us the required security against the possibility of successful invasion by any hostile Power."

I placed on the Paper of your Lordships' House some time ago a request for a Return which would give us all the particulars with reference to our defensive position, but the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for War declined to grant the Return. The information, however, is known to the members of the Foreign Embassies. I asked one of those members if there was any information in the Return for which I asked which he could not supply, and he replied, "We know nothing." The Prime Minister, if he wishes to inform himself as to the state of things, has nothing to do but to send this paper to the Secretary of State for War and get it filled up.

INDIAN FAMINE—PRESENT OUTLOOK.

LORD SANDHURST: My Lords, I beg to ask the noble Earl the Under-Secretary of State for India a question of which I have given him private notice—namely, whether he can give the House any information with regard to the monsoon in India which may possibly tend to alleviate anxiety.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (The Earl of ONSLOW): My Lords, the Secretary of State has received a telegram from the Viceroy of India which, I am happy to say, puts a rather improved complexion upon affairs, which had begun to assume alarming conditions owing to the failure of the monsoon. The Viceroy telegraphed the day before yesterday as follows—

"Heavier and more general rain during last week in Berar, Central Provinces and Hyderabad. Rainfall good and sufficient for present needs in Rajputana. In Central India moderate general rain and sowings commenced in parts. Fair rain has fallen in Bombay, Deccan and Khandeoh. Monsoon is heavy in Surat. Good falls are reported in Kathiawar, Broach, Thana. Sufficient rain has not yet fallen in Punjaub for dry land sowing. Notwithstanding that prospects have improved, no early diminution of relief is possible. On the contrary, the figures this week are the highest yet reported. Village relief and advances are replacing relief works. Condition of surviving cattle is deplorable in Western India. Cholera continues prevalent Bombay. Health Returns for Central Provinces are satisfactory. Number of persons in receipt of relief, 6,148,000."

RITUALISM IN THE CHURCH.

*THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: My Lords, in rising to call attention to the continued lawlessness in the Church of England, and to ask the Prime Minister if he is prepared to give effect to the Resolution of the House of Commons of Wednesday, 10th May, 1899†, I shall confine my remarks to those particular cases in which the clergy have not only revolted against the lawful authority of the highest Court, but against the opinions of the two Archbishops and the moral authority of their ecclesiastical superiors. I do not think that it would be desirable that I should occupy your Lordships' time by entering at any length into the cases outside these—they are indeed very numerous—in which the spirit of the Reformation, and the spirit of the Protestant settlement is continuously and sedulously broken by these offending clergymen. I will confine myself, as I have said, to cases of definite contempt of the law of the land and of episcopal authority. I come first to the question of incense and processional lights. The use of incense was condemned as illegal as long ago as 1868 in the case

† The Resolution is quoted by Lord Salisbury later in this debate. It was moved as an Amendment to the motion for the Second Reading of the Church Discipline Bill, introduced by Mr. McArthur. For the discussion, see *The Parliamentary Debates* [Fourth Series], Vol. lxxi., page 231.

of Martin *v.* Machonochie, and again in the case of Elphinstone *v.* Purchas. Processional lights were declared illegal in the Purchas case, but their use is still continued. About a year or eighteen months ago I called attention in this House to the proceedings that were taking place at a particular church in North Kensington in respect to the ceremonial use of incense and processional lights, and the answer I then received was that these matters had been relegated by mutual consent to the decision of the two Archbishops.* I will read to your Lordships what the opinion of the two Archbishops was. They said—

"We are obliged to come to the conclusion that the use of incense in the public worship and as a part of that worship is not at present enjoined nor permitted by the law of the Church of England, and it is our duty to request the clergy who so use it to discontinue that use. If used at all it must be used (in George Herbert's language) to sweeten the church and outside the worship altogether. It is obvious at once that precisely the same line of reasoning is applicable to the case of processions carrying lights as we have applied to the case of incense. There is no authority for such processions, and they are therefore neither enjoined nor permitted."

After this opinion of the two Archbishops we were treated to a very remarkable lay protest. A deputation waited upon the most rev. Prelate the Archhishop of Canterbury, and the language they used in the memorial they presented was most significant as showing contempt, not only for the law of the land, but for their ecclesiastical superiors. In the memorial which they presented to the most rev. Prelate they made use of these words—

"We as Catholic lay people will resist to the utmost a precedent which may lead us into a position differing but little from that against which the Church rightly protested 300 years ago. We protest against your Grace's attempt to foist upon the Church a penal Act of Parliament passed in days of regal autocracy, and we are the more aggrieved because we were led to suppose that your Grace had intended to investigate the question upon the principles of Catholic law, and not upon the construction of the alleged law of the State."

I wish to express the greatest possible deference and respect to the most rev. Prelate, but I do not think that he was justified in receiving a deputation that chose to employ such language towards him. Whatever our opinion may be as to the views or the policy that may have been taken by the most rev. Prelate, I do not think there is any Member of your Lordships' House who doubts that whatever faults people may suppose to belong to him he is certainly a man of strict justice. If the most rev. Prelate's self-respect did not forbid his officially recognising those who charged him with animus and partiality—for that is the meaning of the words "your Grace's attempt to foist upon the Church"—he should remember that he holds an office of the greatest dignity and subject to the conditions of an Established Church and therefore to the law of the land, and that so long as he enjoys the advantages of his position he is also bound by its limitations and bound to recognise no law other than the actual law which is the law of the State. I do not think it is necessary that I should occupy your Lordships' time by dwelling at any length upon the elaborate reply which the most rev. Prelate addressed to that deputation. The pith of the whole matter is contained in these words, which form part of the reply. Speaking of the opinion of the two Archbishops, which we understood was set up to meet the views of those who declined to recognise the authority of the Privy Council, the most rev. Prelate said that—

"Although the Archbishop has addressed these words to the whole Province, certainly I am not going to admit that the Archbishop has not a right to address every clergyman in his Province—certainly he has not implied that this opinion of his is to be taken as a command to obey unless their Bishops enforce it. It is left for the Bishops to call upon the clergy to take this opinion but if they do not choose to act in this way that of course would set the clergy in that diocese perfectly free from obedience to that opinion. The clergy may very fairly say in that case 'my bishop does not call upon me to obey this opinion, therefore I am not bound by it.'"

Now, my Lords, what does that mean? It means that, instead of the opinions of the two Archbishops being taken and recognised as binding morally upon the clergy, the words are practically only a phrase and simply carry with them moral authority where and when a particular Bishop in a particular diocese chooses to enforce it. I venture to say that that entirely and absolutely gives away the whole case and the whole reason for this tribunal; it is not a legal tribunal, but it was supposed to have some moral authority. The opinion of the two Archbishops was supposed to be, not their individual opinion as Archbishops, but their opinion as the ecclesiastical superiors in the

* See *The Parliamentary Debates* [Fourth Series], Vol. lxix., page 96.

Church of England. I, perhaps, have spoken somewhat strongly upon this point, but I have not spoken one word more strongly than did the late Archbishop Benson. No doubt many of your Lordships have read that very interesting life which has been published of him by his son, and in that book you will find Bishop Westcott's recollections of Archbishop Benson (Vol. xi., p. 697). Speaking of the opinion of Archbishop Benson, Bishop Westcott says—

"He thought the Bishops were becoming ministers of a diocese and not of a church. 'Diocesanism,' he said, 'is a new form of dissent, as virulent as congregationalism, and more.'"

While I deplore the language of the most rev. Prelate I still more deplore the consequences which it has produced. The Archbishops' advice has been gratefully accepted by the sacerdotal Bishops. It was not likely that the right rev. Prelate the Bishop of Lincoln would have cared, even if such words had not been spoken, to obey this opinion, for, within a fortnight of a unanimous decision of the Lambeth Conference forbidding the use of incense and processional lights he preached at what was advertised as High Mass at St. Mary Magdalen, Paddington. The *Daily News*, speaking of that service, said—

"It may be remarked without prejudice that anyone who had witnessed High Mass in a Roman Catholic Church might well—what with the wearing of eucharistic vestments by the officiating clergy, the proceedings at the altar, the bell at consecration, the elevation of the host, the lights and the ceremonial use of incense—have imagined that he was in a Roman place of worship but for the employment of the English tongue instead of the Latin."

Since the opinion of the Archbishops was published what has happened? Why, incense is used in the different dioceses throughout England just as it was before. In London to-day it is used in twenty-five churches. At Perivale a clergyman says he is permitted to use it before and after service with the Bishop's permission and "non-ceremonial use" during the service. In the diocese of Chester—I am quoting from the *Church Times* of 13th October, 1899—a vicar, acting in accordance with the Bishop's advice, proposes in future to use incense during the singing of the hymn immediately preceding the service of Holy Communion; and in the Exeter Diocese the vicar of St. John, Sutton, informed the Bishop that he would confine the use of incense to High Mass. I have touched as cursorily as I could upon these various matters. But, as Mr. Balfour said in the other House, in his speech on the Church Discipline Bill, "What we object to, after all, is not solely or mainly aberrations of ritual." "I think," he said, "that every member of the English Church has a right to have a service in harmony with the spirit of the Prayer-book." I should like to know if any one of the Bishops that I see opposite me this evening has called effectively upon his clergy to give up reservation. I do not believe there is one. I now come to a point which to my mind is one of principle. The questions of incense and processional lights are not in themselves important ones. They are only important as proving what I allude to in my notice as the continued lawlessness in the Church of England. I now come to a very much more serious matter—one which strikes at the root of the real difference between the English Church and the Church of Rome—I mean Holy Communion taking place in cases in which no one communicates except the priest. On this point the rubric says—

"And there shall be no celebration of the Lord's Supper except there be a convenient number to communicate with the priest, and, if there be not above twenty persons in the parish of discretion to receive the communion, yet there shall be no communion except four, or three at least, communicate with the priest."

The rubric is definite, distinct, and absolute on the point. You will find exactly the same teaching running through the other rubrics—

"The priest shall then place on the table so much bread and wine as he shall think sufficient. At the time of the celebration of the communion, the communicants being conveniently placed for the receiving of the Holy Sacrament."

And again—

"Then the priest shall say to them that come to receive the Holy Communion."

And again—

"Then shall this general confession be made in the name of all them that are minded to receive the Holy Communion."

In view of the manner in which some of the earlier Prayer-books have been quoted as more particularly representing the true and proper foundation of the Catholic faith, it is curious to remember that in the first Prayer-book of Edward VI. we find the direction—

"Then so many as shall be partakers of the Holy Communion shall tarry still in the quire;

all other that mind not to receive the said Holy Communion shall depart out of the quire."

The second Prayer-book of Edward VI. omitted this, perhaps because the congregation was no longer invited to come into the choir to deposit alms in the box which used to stand near the altar, or perhaps because a rubric was then first introduced directing that the table at the time of the communion should stand in the body of the church. Be that as it may the following words were added to the form of exhortation to be said "at certain times"—

"As whereas ye offend God so sore in refusing this Holy Banquet I admonish, exhort, and beseech you that ye will not add any more, which thing ye shall do if ye stand by as gazers and lookers on them that do communicate, and be no partakers of the same yourselves. For what thing can this be accounted else than a further contempt and unkindness towards God?"

With regard to the present Prayer-book the Lord Bishop of London, in a charge delivered at St. Paul's Cathedral on 21st February of this year, said—

"The point I wish to emphasise is that the object of the Church of England at the Reformation was to turn the Mass into a Communion. If there are to be no communicants at mid-day, then it is difficult to avoid something which looks perilously like 'turning the Communion into Mass.'"

He also said —

"It is this which creates suspicion and puts a hindrance in the way of many who are honestly trying to adapt the services of the Church to the changed circumstances of modern life."

How are those views carried out in the right rev. Prelate's own diocese? Between 31st March and 7th May there were in the diocese of London fifty churches that disobeyed the Rubric, twenty-five having midday Communions without any communicants except the priest, fifteen with only one communicant, and ten with only two communicants. One cannot be too careful in these matters to be able as one goes along to verify every fact. Of these fifty churches that disobey the Rubric six were visited yesterday, and in those six churches—St. Clement's, City Road; St. Michael's, Shoreditch; St. Augustine's, Stepney; St. Cuthbert's, Philbeach Gardens; St. John the Baptist, Holland Road; and St. Alban's, Holborn—there were Communions, but there was not one single communicant except the priest. A very curious thing happened at St. Augustine's, Stepney. At that church the clergyman took his sermon from the apocryphal book Ecclesiasticus, chapter 50, verse 10, and said that as God's representative he could perform the holy Mass, that he alone could make Christ really present in the elements, that he alone could give absolution for sin, and declared confession to be necessary. I think the instances I have quoted are indicative of a very serious condition of affairs. But before I leave this point I cannot omit to notice a resolution which was passed unanimously by the members of the English Church Union, in which they, in precise, clear, and definite words, pronounce their devotion and adherence to the doctrine of transubstantiation. The resolution was as follows—

"We, the members of the English Church Union, holding fast to the faith and teaching of the one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church —that in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper the bread and wine, through the operation of the Holy Ghost, become, in and by consecration, according to our Lord's institution, verily and indeed the body and blood of Christ, and that Christ our Lord, present in the same most Holy Sacrament of the altar under the form of bread and wine, is to be worshipped and adored—desire, in view of present circumstances, to reaffirm, in accordance with the teaching of the Church, our belief in this verity of the Christian faith, and to declare that we shall abide by all such teaching and practice as follow from this doctrine of the whole Catholic Church of Christ."

There can be no doubt from those words that a certain body of self-constituted persons in the Church of England distinctly claim the right to define the doctrines and the teaching of the Church of England. I do not speak for any one section of the Church; but it is obvious that if any one section of the Church or body are permitted with impunity to make their own special declaration of what these doctrines are, and to give effect to them by particular services, the condition of the Church of England must be anarchical, and that the existence of the established position of the Church of England must cease. I have confined myself only to those points in which the offending clergy have disobeyed both the law of the land and the moral authority of the Archbishops, and of their ecclesiastical superiors. I hope, my Lords, that I have treated sacred matters—for indeed they are sacred matters—with the reverent reserve they should command. But I cannot understand the frame of mind which induces men to claim respect for

their position and to retain office when they repudiate all lawful and moral authority. I do not fail to appreciate the devoted lives and noble self-denial of these men—their devoted lives speak with special force to many, for the tendency is, perhaps, to make too little of personal religion and to make the Church of primary instead of secondary importance—but, when all is said, the Church is not a club or an association of Christian gentlemen for moral and social improvement. The whole basis of the Church of England as an established Church depends upon law, and the clergyman, unlike those of any other Church, holds his living as a freehold. If a Roman Catholic priest refuses to submit to lawful authority he can practically be unfrocked, because he can be forbidden to say Mass. If a minister of one of the Free Churches refuses to carry out the conditions under which his chapel is held he is liable for a breach of trust, and also to the legal penalties of the Court of Chancery. I wish to treat the Roman Catholic doctrines and faith with all the respect they deserve. But Roman Catholic doctrines and practices, without Roman Catholic discipline, and under the prestige and protection of a Protestant Established Church, is, I maintain, incapable of either respect or of apology. Those who wish to see the law maintained do not ask from the clergy of the Established Church any ideal standard; they only ask that they shall be prevented from retaining office the conditions attached to which they refuse to obey. Those conditions are not narrow or restricted. The English Prayer-book is not inquisitorial. It does not seek to define the spirit or the sense in which the communicants receive Holy Communion. It only stipulates that the service shall be performed in a prescribed way. It is a liberal and a comprehensive compromise. The Prayer-book, interpreted by the highest tribunal of the realm, must be and can be the only basis of authority in the Established Church, and those who decline to accept that compromise ought to make up their minds, or have their minds made up for them by others, to go elsewhere. The resolution of 10th May, 1899, which was moved by my noble and learned friend the Master of the Rolls (Lord Alverstone) admitted that if the efforts of the Bishops were not speedily effectual further legislation would be required "to maintain the observance of the existing laws of Church and Realm." Since the passing of that resolution the Bishops have failed, as indeed, my Lords, if their hearts had been in it, they would have been bound to fail. It is all very well to talk about fatherly advice, but what is the use of fatherly advice without parental control? During the progress of the Church Patronage Bill in this House the noble Marquess suggested that a fund should be applicable to proceedings against clergy in cases of gross disobedience to the law. The most rev. Prelate said he never could agree to that, because the funds were applicable to the poorer clergy and he referred to the straitened circumstances of those clergy. What is the position of the Bishops in this matter? The Bishops are not rich men; they are not in receipt of incomes which, considering the enormous claims upon them, leave any margin. They cannot institute costly legal proceedings, and these clergymen know that under the existing state of the law the Bishops have no coercive power. They, therefore, carry on their practices with impunity. But since the passing of the resolution in the House of Commons the Protestant laity have grown into an organised and determined party, with just that touch of fanaticism which is so conducive, judging by experience, to political results; although the war may have absorbed the attention of the London press and of certain classes, the middle classes and the working men in the north and in all the great towns feel very deeply upon this subject, and are not prepared to allow their patriotic zeal in supporting Her Majesty's Government against the enemies of this country abroad to be utilised, if I may so express it, as a political expedient for cheating them out of promised legislation. Knowing as I do these organisations in the north, I should regret it if this matter is allowed to pass out of the hands of a responsible Government. I hope, therefore, that the noble Marquess will be able to give some assurance that a practical measure will be introduced and carried through this House with the sole object of making the clergy obey the law.

THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: My Lords, it is, no doubt, perfectly true that the opinions of the Archbishops, communicated through the

Bishops to the clergy, have not been so speedily obeyed as might have been expected before those opinions were given; but, at the same time, I must remind the House that this is not the first time that I have prayed your Lordships to remember the difficulties of dealing with such matters as these, where men's consciences are so very much strained, where men feel so very strongly, and where it is exceedingly difficult for men to change the course that they had previously pursued, and very difficult indeed for them to dissever themselves from those with whom they have previously acted. And I have urged before, as I must urge again, that in such matters it is really necessary, unless you would do most serious injustice, to be patient in dealing with offenders of this kind, who are perplexed by the position in which they find themselves, who very largely indeed really desire to obey the voice of authority, but who, at the same time, are held back by very natural feelings and by the belief that practices which they have pursued are really within the law of the Church. The Archbishops gave an opinion on the question of the use of incense. I do not suppose that any of the Bishops, or the Archbishops themselves, at all expected that in every single instance the clergymen would immediately obey. I do not suppose, indeed, that the Bishops expected that there would be such an approach to obedience as has been actually made. I confess, and I said it before anything of this sort occurred, that I expected that there would be some who would stand out against everything that we could say upon the matter; and I urged that we ought to allow time for what was said to operate on their minds, and that I believed that if patience were practised in this way we might save the Church of England from the great disaster of the disruption of the whole body. I repeat, that the opinions expressed in regard to incense have been very largely followed. It is not the case that those opinions of the Archbishops have been disregarded by the clergy altogether. It is not the case that they have been disregarded even by a majority of those who previously continued in this practice. The great majority have already conformed to what the Bishops have urged upon them, and this is exactly what we hoped. I have no doubt at all that in the course of time we shall succeed in bringing all these clergymen to understand that what we are asking them to do is to submit to the law of the Church to which they belong, and that we are not asking them to give up anything that is permitted by that law. The opinions on the question of reservation have not yet had time to take possession of men's minds in the same degree. There are, I have no doubt, still a great many who practise what, in our judgment, we pronounced to be outside the law; but we receive expressions of opinion on all hands, even from those who are really disturbed in mind upon the matter, which indicate that by giving a little more time we shall succeed in very largely altering these practices also; and I do not think it would be well for the Church if any violent means were used at the present time to compel obedience, instead of winning it by quiet and steady perseverance. It is true, of course, that there are great diversities of opinion in the Church. It is true that there are men whose opinions on the subject of Holy Communion go very far in the direction of the Roman Catholic doctrine. But even those who signed the declaration which was published the other day would, as far as I believe, with but very few exceptions, repudiate altogether the Roman Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation, and would declare that they do not mean that and do not intend to teach it. And, my Lords, it must always be borne in mind that these questions are very often very difficult to handle, and that it is quite possible to mistake men's meaning when you are dealing with the words which they use. The quotations which the noble Earl has given us seem very near to the Roman doctrine—and yet those who know the subject well can see a distinction, and the distinction is real and deep—and it is quite certain that the body of the clergy of the Church of England do not hold, and are not prepared to hold, and will not hold the Roman doctrine in this matter. Further, it must be remembered that in regard to the administration of the rubrics, it is very often very difficult now to do what would have been comparatively easy two hundred years ago, when it was the practice for no one to come to the Holy Communion without previously giving notice to the priests in accordance to the rubric. It was very easy for the priest to pass over the occasion when he found there was not

The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.

a sufficient number to communicate with him. But that practice has quite passed out of use, and it constantly happens that the priest, expecting to find a number of communicants ready to receive with him, finds that, by accident, they are not there. I do not mean to deny that there are those who disregard the rubric entirely. The case has not, as your Lordships know, come before me for an opinion. I have not heard it argued. I have no doubt at all that the Church of England does not allow solitary communion by the priest, and wherever I have had an opportunity to know of it I have always interfered to put a stop to it. Whenever I have had occasion to interfere in this way I have always been obeyed hitherto. I think I may fairly ask your Lordships to pause a little in the handling of so serious, delicate, and difficult a matter. The Bishops, I can assure you, are quite in earnest, but they are bound—the Church at large would hold them to be bound, I am quite sure every one of your Lordships on reflection would hold them to be bound—to do their very utmost in the way of conciliation before recourse is had to any legislation on the subject. I, for my part, am quite ready, in my own diocese, to allow of the prosecution of any clergyman who disregards the opinions which I have expressed in reference to the matters which have been argued before me, and let it go to the furthest limit that it can go. But the noble Earl has himself pointed out that it is not the business of the Bishops to prosecute. It is the business of the Bishops to do all they can as Fathers in God to win their clergy over to the path marked out for them by the formularies of the Church. Nor am I prepared to question that, in many cases, those who keep within the formularies of the Church, as interpreted by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, still would be held by the great majority of the adherents of the noble Earl as altogether offending against the Church's law. It must not be forgotten that the great question as to the character of the Holy Communion, which was argued in the case of Mr. Bennett, of Frome, was decided in favour of refusing to condemn language of a strong nature which spoke of believing, and teaching others to believe, that the Lord was Himself present in the consecrated elements of the Holy Communion.

THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: I did not refer to that case. The case I referred to was that of Mr. Ridsdale, tried by Lord Penzance.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: I was careful to note that fact. I did not say that the noble Earl referred to that case. I particularly remarked that he did not refer to it, which I thought rather indicated that he was a little afraid of referring to it, because the effect of that case has been really to give the impression that a great deal is authorised in the Church of England which has not been really authorised, although the inference is so exceedingly natural. In that case the Privy Council went to the utmost length of giving liberty to the teaching of doctrine which they themselves acknowledge was not the teaching that was naturally to be drawn from the formularies of the Church, but which they said they could not condemn because the Church had nowhere forbidden the holding or teaching of it. My Lords, I certainly believe that of all things Parliament could do there is hardly anything which would be more disastrous to the Church than to legislate upon the doctrine of the Church, and set aside such a decision as that given by the authority which the noble Earl has again and again declared to be the highest authority for deciding what the doctrine of the Church really is. My Lords, I maintain that whatever we are to do we ought at any rate to take care that we do not narrow the Church of England. She rests upon the right and the duty of private judgment which requires that men shall conscientiously accept her teaching. It is based upon the supposition that men shall think for themselves. You cannot have a Church where the basis is of this character, and, at the same time, say that divergence of opinion is not to be allowed. The one inevitably follows from the other. There must be a wide divergence of opinion if the Church of England is to hold her place. The great decisions in the Gorham case long ago, and in the Bennett case at a later date, marked the character of the supreme tribunal to which these matters have been referred, and in both cases the supreme tribunal has pronounced in favour of the very widest liberty; and to say, after those decisions, that men are not to accept the liberty thus opened before

them is altogether inconsistent with the position which any party in the Church of England has a right to claim. I believe that, if you will leave this matter in the hands of the Bishops, in course of time we shall be able so to deal with it as to keep the Church of England one Church, and at the same time quietly to get rid of any of those irregularities of which so much complaint is made. In the decisions I have had to give I do not think anyone can say that there has been any unwillingness on my part to pronounce decidedly where a decided pronouncement seemed to be my duty; nor shall I hesitate if any similar cases come before me. But I am acting under the authority of the Prayer-book, which distinctly imposes upon the Archbishop the duty of deciding on these points of ritual, and, in accordance with that declaration in the Prayer-book, I have undertaken to hear such cases and decide them to the best of my ability. I know the Prayer-book gives me no power to coerce. I know perfectly well that the Prayer-book does not constitute the Archbishop or the two Archbishops a court with power to punish. I know all I can do is simply to declare what, in my opinion, having been entrusted by the Book of Common Prayer with the duty of forming an opinion—what, in my opinion, is within the Church's law or outside it; and you may depend upon it that the Bishops will not shrink from their duty in this matter. The noble Earl complained that I spoke to a deputation that waited upon me as if I had not the power to give directions to clergy outside my own diocese. I did so because it is the law. The clergy outside my diocese are responsible to their own Bishops, and it certainly would not be within the limits of the jurisdiction of an Archbishop to step in between a Bishop and his clergy and to give orders which they are to obey, whether the Bishop required it or not. I have carefully kept within the law. It may be that, in my desire to conciliate, some may think I did wrong. The noble Earl thinks I did wrong in listening to the deputation at all, inasmuch as they used language which, perhaps, was hardly consistent with their position and with my position. But, my Lords, whatever I might think of the language they used, I thought that to receive them and explain to them anything that wanted explaining was part of that conciliation which I believe it to be my duty to practise. I will only add to all this that I am confident that if Parliament will allow us to deal with this matter as Bishops of the Church we shall be able to do, quietly but perhaps not so rapidly as many would desire, all that it is really necessary should be done. With this assurance to your Lordships, I can but hope that the noble Marquess will not hold out anything which will make it more difficult than it is at present to deal with those who are good men, conscientious men, and devoted men, and, although they are mistaken men, yet deserve that kind of handling which ought to be given to men of such high religious character and of such devoted service.

THE EARL OF CRANBROOK: My Lords, may I be permitted, as a loyal and obedient son of the Church, who is not a member of any association, union, or league, to say a few words on this question? Last year I took the opportunity of joining in an address to the Bishops begging them to use their fatherly counsel with a view to bringing to an end the difficulties which had arisen in the Church, and I have to thank the two Archbishops for the care, diligence, and skill with which they discharged the duty which the Prayer-book imposes upon them in this connection. No one, I think, can doubt that the conclusions at which they have arrived are correct in accordance with the teaching of the rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer. It is very easy when people are trying patiently to undo a knot, and are doing it with a view to the saving and continuance, so to speak, of the string, to rush in and say—"Take my knife, cut this knot, and bring this thing to an end." We have had experience from the Public Worship Act and from other Acts that you do not so easily and so speedily cut the knot as you suppose. For my part I am quite ready to hand over to the Bishops that for which they are responsible. These societies of which the noble Earl has spoken do not represent the great body of the laity of the Church of England. The Church of England is doing a great work, and a work which no one who is not well acquainted with it can imagine. It was shown in the official year-book of the Church of England that last year over £7,000,000 was raised for the purposes of

the Church; and while all this is going on an attempt is being made to prove that there is a great crisis in the Church. The Church Missionary Society has done magnificent work the world over, and one cannot but regret that this debate is taking place at a time when we hear of most inhuman proceedings in China in which missionaries of the Church of England have suffered. I am sure my noble friends who are members of the Roman Catholic Church will not feel that I am saying anything against them or their creed when I say that the religion of the Church of England is, after all, a reformed Catholic religion; and the attempt—if anyone is making the attempt—absolutely to reconcile the two is wholly impossible of success. Although Archbishop Tait was largely instrumental in carrying the Public Worship Act, how did he proceed in his later years? Was he so desirous of rushing into litigation, or of letting those under him rush into litigation? We know that in order to see the work that was being carried on he visited one parish where very extreme views were adopted. He found that the people were calling the priest "Father," and were living in accordance with the principles he had enjoined upon them, and he would not allow a prosecution. Can it be wondered at that when the Bishops see the enormous good that is being done in many of these cases they endeavour to conciliate rather than rush into court? I pray your Lordships not to listen to any idea of bringing about fresh complications by new courts and new proceedings, or of the introduction of Bills which will create confusion, difficulties, and complications, the extent of which it is hardly possible to imagine. Let us leave the matter to those whom we have put in authority. Let us all, and especially the clergy, bind ourselves to submit to the law we have undertaken to support.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (The Marquess of SALISBURY): My Lords, I should not have ventured to intervene in this debate if the noble Lord had not put my name in his question. It appears to me that the reference which he has made is one of a very unusual and inconvenient character. The resolution to which he refers was passed by the House of Commons, and he asks us whether we are going to put it into effect. I have no doubt that the House of Commons will be very much obliged to the noble Earl for the lifting hand which he has given to it, but I think the House of Commons is quite capable of looking after its own affairs. If this resolution is, as he thinks, a pledge for future legislation, he may be quite certain that in that House men will be found who will press that necessity. The resolution is as follows—

> "That this House, while not prepared to accept a measure which creates fresh offences and ignores the authority of the Bishops in maintaining discipline in the Church, is of opinion that if the efforts now being made by the Archbishops and Bishops to secure due discipline are not speedily effectual further legislation will be required to obtain the observance of the existing law of the Church and Realm."

I understand the noble Earl to contend that the contingency foreseen by the resolution has occurred, and that the measures of the Archbishops and Bishops to secure the obedience of the clergy are not effectual. It all depends upon the definition of that word "speedily." This resolution was passed in the May of last year. The time has been occupied since then by the Archbishops in determining two or three of the most burning questions which separate members of the Church; and it is physically impossible that the alteration of practices which the authors of this resolution had in view should have taken place at so early a date. I have gladly asked the Archbishop to take the first place in the debate, because I not only demur to the particular form which the noble Earl has selected, but also because I do not admit that the secular and political authority is the kind of authority which deals most fitly with such a matter as this. We have heard the most eloquent and the most instructive language of the most rev. Prelate, and it is upon him that the responsibility falls of inducing his clergy to obey what he conceives to be the law of the Church of England. It is certainly not a matter of political jurisdiction, and I should very much deplore the day on which our separations in political matters should be in any degree reflected in our manner of proceeding in reference to matters of conflict in the Church. I cannot imagine anything that would be more injurious to our politics or more corrupting to our

religion. That being the case, how are we to determine the meaning of this word "speedily"? How are we to determine whether the efforts of the Archbishops and Bishops have or have not been effectual during the twelve or thirteen months in which they have been applied? The first consideration that suggests itself to me is that their testimony is a most essential point. Do they tell us that their efforts have not been effectual? You have listened to the most rev. Prelate. He tells you that on the first question raised he has had a large and an increasing measure of success; and he does not doubt that on the other questions, which have been considered at a later date, he shall be quite as successful in his endeavour to induce the clergy to accept his persuasive ruling. It is of no use concealing from yourselves this fact, that either you must provide machinery and agents which can persuade the clergy to obey, or you must undertake the effort of forcing them by all the mechanism that litigation can place at your command. It is needless to point out to you how much bitterness, how much danger to the Church of England any undue encouragement of litigation would cause. But it is not only that. It is an ineffectual process. The noble Earl denounced with great effectiveness the protest made by the English Church Union. I am not here to praise or to blame that utterance. In fact, I am afraid I have not read it. But be it good or be it bad your legislation would be utterly powerless in the matter. Any number of gentlemen may gather together and call themselves the English Church Union, and may pass resolutions on any subject, human or divine, and there is nothing in our law or Constitution to hinder them. So it is with many other matters. I hear a great denunciation of the Confessional—I have expressed my opinion on more than one occasion in this House upon that question—but you cannot stop it by legislation. If A tells his secrets to B, nothing you can put in the Statute-book would give the slightest hope of preventing him from doing it. If you trust to litigation you have a very poor prospect before you. It will lead to a very stormy time. Many evil passions will be aroused; many good works will be stopped, and much combined effort for the advancement of the community in morality and religion will be arrested. If you depend on this litigation, that must be the fate you will meet, and therefore it is that I am in favour not of giving to the adverb "speedily" an interpretation which is absurdly violent, as the noble Earl has done. I should rather strain the matter in the opposite direction, and exercise the utmost possible patience, in order that by persuasion, and by all arts other than those which depend upon litigation, the Bishops might gradually induce those of the clergy who have shown themselves unreasonable or recalcitrant to conform to the general spirit and the general formularies of the Church of England. I have no doubt that they will succeed. On the other hand, I have no doubt that that success will be seriously marred if you attempt, by the rough processes of litigation, to interfere with their action. It would be undoing their work. But if you accept the belief, which is sustained by all that they tell us of the consequences of the action which they are taking, I think everything in our past history and present experiences points to the fact that we shall reach without danger and without any formidable disturbance a period of calm and progressive utility in the work of the Church of England.

VISCOUNT HALIFAX: My Lords, I have no desire to prolong the discussion, but after what has been said I do not think I ought to be altogether silent. It would be wasting your Lordships' time to comment in any detail on the different statements made by the noble Earl who is responsible for this discussion. It is easy to make such statements if you assume all the questions in dispute. Everyone is agreed that the law ought to be obeyed; the difficulty arises when there is grave doubt what the law is. The noble Earl used at one time to have some acquaintance with one who was then amongst the most distinguished clergymen in the Church of England. No man could insist more strongly than Canon Liddon on the duty of obedience to the legitimate exercise of ecclesiastical authority, but the noble Earl knows, as well as I do, that Canon Liddon, as, indeed, he showed by his own conduct, would have rejected decisively the assumptions and the conclusions founded on those assumptions which make up the greater part of the noble

Earl's speech. It is not difficult to profess an ideal regard for law in the case of others which is by no means so apparent in ourselves. But I think it is always a shock to discover that those who are so rigorous on precept and severe on chastisement are themselves lamentably deficient in practice. I would ask the noble Earl whether it accords with any very genuine regard for law and religion to be associated with robbers of churches, and those who are responsible for the mutilation of the monuments of the dead and the disturbance of divine service. For myself, I think I should distrust a cause which numbers persons of that description amongst its supporters. These, however, are personal matters. The question is, what is the real value of the assertions of lawlessness or disregard of Episcopal authority that have been made in the course of this discussion? Sweeping statements as to general disobedience and lawlessness save a great deal of trouble, but they do not do much to promote an equitable judgment. I would invite your Lordships to come to particulars. As some of your Lordships may, perhaps, be aware, I have recently been engaged in an attempt to get representatives of various opinions in the Church to meet together in order to see if the differences which divide them are really as great as they seem, and whether a great deal might not be done by mutual explanation to mitigate these differences, if not to remove them. I made a similar attempt in 1874, when we had another of these periodical crises in ecclesiastical affairs, which make a stir at the time, but which leave so little trace behind them. It was at the time when the Public Worship Regulation Act was being passed by the somewhat humorous combination, if you come to think of it, of Lord Beaconsfield and Sir William Harcourt, Archbishop Tait and the Earl of Shaftesbury. It was a combination of very distinguished and remarkable men, but it was also one which shows that distinguished and remarkable men may sometimes make mistakes. That Act, like the Bills which have recently emanated from Liverpool, and like the motion of the noble Earl, was ostensibly brought forward only for the purpose of enforcing what was assumed to be the of the Church. It was pointed out that this was by no means a complete account of the measure, that it was in reality a measure directed against the representatives of the entire Oxford Movement, and that if it passed it would either be practically inoperative, or productive of very serious mischief. Those remonstrances were not listened to, the Bill was passed, and the alleged illegalities of Canon Liddon and others were adduced as a reason for declining all the proposals for a conference in the interest of peace and a better understanding. What was the result? Several clergymen were sent to prison—one was shut up in Lancaster Castle for nearly two years—at the instigation not of any aggrieved parishioner, but of outsiders; in one case of outsiders of notoriously bad character. Eventually the very court, disregard of whose decisions had constituted the offence for which these clergymen were imprisoned, discovered that the matters for which they had been sent to prison were almost all of them not offences at all, but matters covered by and in harmony with the directions of the Prayer-book. Is there no lesson very applicable to present circumstances here? Practices which were said to make the Public Worship Regulation Act necessary and a conference impossible have turned out to be justified by the Prayer-book after all. Is it not extremely probable that the practices which the noble Earl alleges as a reason for his motion, and for the agitation which he thinks it his duty to promote, may also eventually be found to be in harmony with the Prayer-book and the teaching of the Church of England? Sir John Kennaway, whom I am proud to call a friend of mine, evidently thinks so, and his opinion is entitled to consideration. Only last year, in a discussion in the House of Commons on this very subject, he pointed out what difficulties the authors of the Liverpool Bills might be preparing for themselves by their proposed legislation. But, my Lords, the noble Earl will perhaps say that he has not been talking about courts, but about Bishops, that it is not disobedience to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council that he complains of, but disregard to the injunctions and opinions of the Episcopate. Now, my Lords, whatever may be the force of this appeal in itself, it is one which in the mouth of the noble Earl and his friends is strangely out of place. To begin with it is not to the Bishops as such that the

noble Earl and his friends proclaim the duty of obedience. It is to Bishops only so long as they enforce particular decisions of particular courts to whom, according to the noble Earl and his friends, any obedience is due. You have only to read the organs in the Press which support the noble Earl, and the policy which is becoming associated with his name, to see the amount of respect which he and his friends really have for the Episcopate. I was present not long ago at one of those large meetings in the Albert Hall, largely made up of members of different Nonconformist societies, over which the noble Earl is in the habit of presiding, and if I heard a great deal of fault found with myself, I was able to console myself with the reflection that a great deal more fault was found with the bishops. Only last Friday the chief organ of the party represented by the noble Earl, and which always gives every prominence to anything which either he or Mr. Kensit may say or do, stated that no good could be done till Parliament had purged the present Episcopal Bench of half of its present occupants. We have heard of the application of Colonel Pride's purge to the House of Commons. Now it appears we are to have a similar purge, only associated with the noble Earl's name, applied to a section of your Lordships' House. Advocates of such measures can hardly claim to be ardent supporters of the Episcopate, but though I find it impossible to take the noble Earl seriously when he professes a scrupulous regard for Episcopal and Ecclesiastical authority, there are others who have recently been speaking of the obedience due to Bishops whose utterances on the subject of obedience to Episcopal authority are entitled to every respect. For example, the Dean of Windsor, whom to know is to respect, the other day, in his place in Convocation, seemed to proclaim the duty of absolute obedience to the Episcopate under all circumstances and without any qualification. "Those," he said, "who had promised to obey their spiritual rulers could not be absolved from that promise by any view they might take as to what was the Catholic Faith." Now, my Lords, I think statements of this sort require examination. I think their adoption would have landed us in not inconsiderable difficulties in the past, and would land us in no inconsiderable difficulties in the present and future. To begin with, it is quite obvious that if they had been always accepted they would have made the Reformation in England impossible. In the next place, what would they have led to in our own experience? Not so very long ago a Bishop—and a very distinguished Bishop too, both as a scholar and a schoolmaster—threatened to suspend the licence of any curate who preached in a surplice. The Bishop of Winchester of the day for sixteen years refused to ordain Mr. Keble's curate for teaching, in regard to the Eucharist, what I should doubt if a single Bishop on the bench would venture to dispute now. My Lords, there is no authority in the world, even the most spiritual, which is not limited, and to talk of the absolute duty of obedience to Bishops or to anyone else, without any regard to the nature of the commands given, appears to me to be opposed to all the principles of right reason, sound theology, and altogether contrary to that spirit of rightful liberty and independence which characterises Englishmen. In another communion the assertion is sometimes attempted that no one is to criticise anything any Bishop may say on any question touching faith or morals, but it is a principle I certainly do not wish to see adopted amongst ourselves; and yet, my Lords, we hear things said about Episcopal authority which show that there is some danger of it. Only the other day I was told by a most distinguished member of the London press—a great Radical, by the bye—that the real object of the Bishops' seats in the House of Lords was that they should be able to tell your Lordships what were the moral aspects of such a war as that now being waged in South Africa, and to direct us to right conclusions on the subject. Again, only last week a distinguished member of the Canterbury Convocation declared—I do not remember his exact words, but this was the effect of them—that it was an indecency for a combination of laity and clergy to state in regard to existing controversies what they had always been taught, and what they believe. I can only say that I cannot agree with such opinions. I think the lay members of your Lordships' House are quite as well qualified as the Archbishop of Canterbury himself to judge of the moral aspects of this or any other war, and I also think it a strange way of encouraging an intelligent

interest in Church matters amongst the laity, which is said to be so desirable, to tell them that they are on no account to presume to express an opinion as to their faith. Though it is quite true that the Bishops and the synods of the Church are indeed the guardians of the faith and practice of the Church, I do not know that their spiritual office gives them any special qualification for the interpretation of Acts of Parliament, even if those Acts be Acts of uniformity. Upon such subjects we are all entitled to our own opinions. This brings me to the question of the recent declaration on Eucharistic doctrine, which, amongst other things, is, I am aware, responsible for much that has been said to-day. Now, my Lords, that declaration is theologically identical with the statements drawn up by Dr. Pusey for Mr. Bennett when the latter was prosecuted by the party which is represented by the noble Earl who introduced this discussion. As your Lordships are aware, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council did not venture to say that that statement was inconsistent with the formularies of the Church of England. Does the noble Earl accept that decision of the Judicial Committee or does he not? If he does, how does he justify all that he and his friends go about the country saying of the disloyalty and faithlessness to solemn obligations of such as myself and others? If he does not, how does he differ, on his own showing, from those who, like myself, are unable to recognise the competency of a court like the Judicial Committee to declare the doctrine and the ritual of the Church of England? So far as the noble Earl is concerned I might stop here, but I have no wish to shelter myself under any technicalities. The Bishops and the synods are the real guardians of the faith of the Church. Will the Archbishops and the Bishops collectively say that the Declaration, for the issuing of which I am, no doubt, to some extent responsible, is inconsistent with that Catholic belief which we profess every time we recite the Creeds? If they will say so clearly and unmistakably, and with all due formality, they will certainly relieve themselves from any future trouble at the hands of the so-called Ritualists. As far as they are concerned there will then be peace. Whether it will be that sort of peace of which it was said, *Solitudinem faciunt, pacem appellant*, I will not stop to inquire. But if the archbishops and bishops decline to make any such statements, if they know, as they do, that such a statement cannot be made, then, my Lords, let us at least hear no more of these charges of disobedience, false doctrine, and disloyalty to the Church that give their only point to the speeches we have heard to-night. There is one other matter in connection with these accusations of lawlessness with which I must trouble your Lordships. The noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack, the other day, compared the conduct of those who thought it their duty to allege an impediment at the solemnisation of the marriage of divorced persons in church with that of those who rendered themselves liable to imprisonment for robbing churches and defacing monuments. I think the noble and learned Lord said that the one class of persons were as much guilty of illegal brawling and indecent conduct as the other. It would be the height of presumption in a layman unlearned in the law to differ on a legal matter with the Lord Chancellor of England, but what is such a layman to do when great legal luminaries themselves disagree? Your Lordships have recently welcomed into this House the very distinguished lawyer who is now Master of the Rolls. Lord Alverstone, when Sir Richard Webster, was formally consulted some time ago on the point in question, and gave his formal opinion—the opinion is dated 27th May, 1895—as follows—

> "We are of opinion that it is lawful for any person present in church . . . . to allege in response to the invitation of the priest any fact which he . . . believes, and has reasonable ground for believing to be a just cause or impediment to the marriage either by God's law or by the law of the Realm."

I will say no more on this subject, except that if Lord Alverstone's opinion cannot be contradicted there is all the difference in the world between an act which is not illegal, which is not a statutable offence, and which is provided for by the rubrics, and one which, as the Lord Chancellor told your Lordships the other day, subjects the perpetrators of it to imprisonment for three months. My Lords, I will only say, in conclusion, that the policy advocated by the noble Earl who has provoked the discussion is a policy which, on the showing of those responsible for it, cannot rely on a sufficient support of members of the

Church, but has to depend on the support of the Nonconformist bodies who are already making it a condition of their political support that the disestablishment of the Church shall be an open question. It is the policy of a party which seems incapable of ever learning anything by experience, which cannot rise above the most antiquated prejudices and the most illiberal opinions. It is the policy of the party who opposed Roman Catholic emancipation as long as it was possible to do so. It is the policy of those who now are unwilling to do justice to Roman Catholic claims in Ireland in regard to university education, who have always opposed, and who oppose now the repeal of those antiquated and illiberal religious disabilities imposed on the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland and the Lord Chancellor of England, which in the press laments over the number of Roman Catholic officers serving in South Africa, and which the other day ventured to find fault with Her Majesty the Queen for visiting Roman Catholic convents and charitable institutions in Ireland. It is the party whose members in Liverpool are known as those who abuse the Pope and do not go to church. It is the party of religious exclusion and persecution. It is the party which has not the wit to see that religious belief, and the practices which flow from religious belief, can never be put down by coercion, and that as things are, whether we like it or not, the choice lies between a wise and a large toleration, honestly accepted in the hope that at some future time it may lead, as a generous toleration always does, to a greater measure of agreement, or such drastic measures as are either bound to fail, or, if they should succeed, must necessarily destroy the great and unrivalled opportunities for good opening out before the Church of England, and inevitably lead to disruption and disaster.

*The Lord Bishop of WINCHESTER: My Lords, I do not rise to make a speech, nor should I intervene with a single word but for two things; first, the statement of the Prime Minister that he desired to be guided to some extent by the statistical and other facts which the Bishops could give as to what is being done, and secondly, the fact that the noble Earl, Lord Portsmouth, is a resident in the diocese of Winchester. The significance of the second fact is this: the noble Earl has stated to-night in a positive and sweeping way that the Bishops' efforts, if made at all, have been futile, and (to quote what I think is his phrase) that "things go on exactly as they did before." Now I want to ask the noble Earl, instead of ranging so far afield for his instances, to take simply the diocese to which he belongs, and with which, presumably, he is best acquainted. It is because it is his own diocese that I call his attention to it as an example of what is really happening. Here then are the bare facts. About a year and a half ago I sent to every incumbent in the diocese of Winchester—566 in number—a circular letter, specifying certain points—I think they were twelve or thirteen in all—on which difficulty might arise in regard to ritual observance. I asked that where any difficulty was felt in following what seemed to me the law, incumbents should consult me about it without delay. I received 176 replies, and have reason to know that these replies covered all the churches at which such difficulties or doubt did arise. To these I replied severally, stating where in my opinion it was necessary that some change should be effected, and this answer was sufficient to satisfy all but fifteen incumbents. With those fifteen I have since been in communication by correspondence or interviews, and to the best of my belief there is not now a church in the diocese which is defying the authority I have endeavoured to exert. I am not prepared to say that in every church the services are exactly what I desire to see, or, still less, what the noble Earl would desire to see, but what I mean is that there is not, to the best of my belief, at this moment a single incumbent within the diocese who is deliberately disobeying the directions I have given about ritual observance.

MEMBERS OF LOCAL AUTHORITIES RELIEF BILL [H.L.].

House in Committee (according to Order).

The Duke of NORTHUMBERLAND: My Lords, I told the House on the Second Reading that the Association of Poor Law Unions was in favour of this Bill. Since then I have received a communication from the Association stating that it approves of one of the Amendments of which Lord Harris has given notice.

Therefore, I desire to modify my statement by saying that the Association concurs in the general principle of the measure though not in all its details.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2 :—

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (The Marquess of LANSDOWNE): I beg to move an Amendment to leave out the word "private" in Clause 2, for the reason that the term "private soldier" would not include non-commissioned officers.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 2, page 1, line 9, to leave out 'private,' and in line 10, to leave out 'private.'" —(*The Marquess of Lansdowne.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Other Amendments agreed to.

Clause 3 amended and agreed to.

Bill recommitted to the Standing Committee; and to be printed as amended. (No. 187.)

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT (1897) EXTENSION BILL.

[THIRD READING.]

Order of the Day for the Third Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read the third time."—(*Viscount Cross.*)

THE EARL OF WEMYSS: I should like, with your Lordships' permission, to say a very few words before this Bill passes. I quite admit that the Bill is a necessary and natural consequence of the Act of 1897, but I strongly object to the policy of such Bills. The agricultural labourer was left out of the Act of 1897. Of course it would never do to place other workmen under the shelter of the Act and leave agricultural labourers out, especially just before a General Election. That we readily understand. But I contend that, when once you have started on these lines, you cannot possibly stop, and domestic servants even will have to be included. Does anyone believe that you can exclude the cook who burns her fingers or gets scalded in cooking the dinner, or that the housemaid who breaks her ankle can be left out? Of course, this legislation will have to extend to them. That is as certain as is the fact that the sun will rise to-morrow, and if it is not done by my noble friend it will be done by someone on the other side of the House. I saw my doctor this morning, and he appeared to misunderstand the Bill. He thought it was a Bill to include domestic servants, and he said that if that was the case he would never give a vote again for a Conservative; and he added that he would do without domestic servants in future. This sort of legislation, moreover, will tend to reduce wages and employment. In the competition which is going on, every charge which the employer of labour has to bear has to be considered, and, where possible, leads to a reduction of wages. This legislation has already reduced employment. Persons of certain age are not employed now in consequence of liability to accidents. I once had a discussion in this House with reference to a rule adopted at a certain large works to the effect that no man should be engaged over sixty years of age. As a result of this sort of legislation no men are employed, if it can be helped, who have any defect of eye, hand, or limb. Employment is thereby diminished, old people are turned out of work, and wages are reduced. If it is found impossible to reduce wages, then prices will go up. In my opinion there is much that is dangerous in this kind of legislation. If people knew that it tended to lessen wages, I am sure there would not be such a demand for it. I have made inquiries as to how this Bill will affect myself personally. I find that if I insure—a course which everyone who is wise should adopt—the insurance of those employed by me would be between £30 and £40. To some people this is a very large sum, and if it is deducted from the wages of the men it amounts to a reduction of one-fifth of a penny per day. I think it is probable that, as a matter of principle and with the view of bringing home to the men concerned the bearing of this sort of legislation, I shall deduct this amount from the wages. I protest against this sentimental, liberty-interfering-with, and mistaken legislation. My opinion is that the best form of Government would be secured by having a strong Conservative Opposition and a Liberal Govern-

ment—falsely called liberal, for there is no liberty about them—with a good working majority of one. Then I think we should get on much better, for at the present moment both parties are tobogganing down the Socialistic ladder. When the question is put from the Woolsack I shall say "not content," for I believe this legislation to be contrary to all the principles which form our nation, and which made the English people a great, a free, and a ruling race.

VISCOUNT CROSS: I do not know that the noble Earl requires an answer from me. He said that the Bill was inevitable, and if it is inevitable it must pass. His principal objection was to something that was not in the Bill—namely, the extension of the Act of 1897 to domestic servants. He said, however, that that would be the next step, but I reply that sufficient for the day is the evil thereof. The noble Earl also said this sort of legislation tended to reduce wages. We have had the Act of 1897 in operation for three years, and we have had no complaint from the workmen that their wages have been lowered. They appear so content with the Act of 1897 that it would be almost cruelty not to extend its provisions to agricultural labourers. I trust your Lordships will recognise that the Act of 1897 has worked well, and will allow this Bill to pass.

On Question, agreed to.

Bill read 3ª accordingly, with the Amendment, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

COUNTY COURTS (IRELAND) BILL [H.L.].

House in Committee (according to Order).

THE EARL OF DARTREY: I should like to ask the noble and learned Lord in charge of this Bill if it is intended that decrees actually in existence before the passing of this Bill shall be affected by the new arrangements in Clauses 14 and 15.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR OF IRELAND (Lord ASHBOURNE): Any decrees and orders that are current at the date of the coming into operation of this Bill will come within the remedy that is intended, and the Bill will apply to them.

THE EARL OF MAYO: Does this law exist in England, or is it a new law for Ireland?

LORD ASHBOURNE: I am not well acquainted with the law in England with regard to the renewal of county court decrees, but we are dealing in Clauses 14 and 15 with a rather long and complicated Irish code. The present complicated procedure is swept away under this Bill.

Clauses agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and recommitted to the Standing Committee.

VETERINARY SURGEONS (AMENDMENT) BILL.

House in Committee (according to Order); Bill reported without amendment; and recommitted to the Standing Committee.

House adjourned at Seven of the Clock, till To-morrow, at Half-past Ten of the clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 16th July, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

DURHAM (COUNTY OF) ELECTRIC POWER SUPPLY BILL. (BY ORDER.)

As amended, considered.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time."—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

MR. GALLOWAY (Manchester, S.W.): I objected to this motion when it was made on Friday, and the result of my so doing is that the Bill stands now in the position it would have occupied if the motion had not been proposed. I do strongly protest against special facilities being granted to these companies. I do not know why we should be asked to suspend Standing Orders. I cannot

understand why the promoters of this Bill should be in such a violent and hysterical hurry to get their Bill through. They have taken up a considerable amount of the time of the Committee, for I believe the Chairman and his colleagues sat nearly nine weeks upon the Bill to consider whether the preamble was proved, and in order to go through the measure line by line. I have seen a large number of statements put forward in support of the Bill containing grossly exaggerated and inaccurate assertions on matters as to which really the decision of the Committee has never been challenged. That decision has been loyally accepted by those concerned. I can only add that in another place individual towns will renew their opposition, and, therefore, under the circumstances, I do not intend to press my objection to a division.

*MR. EVELYN CECIL (Hertfordshire) said that on behalf of Hertfordshire he wished to join in the protest made by his hon. friend against the suspension of the Standing Orders in connection with similar Bills to this one.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed.

SOUTH WALES ELECTRICAL POWER DISTRIBUTION BILL. (BY ORDER.)

As amended, considered.

MR. MACLEAN (Cardiff) stated that he withdrew his opposition to this Bill, as the representatives of the populations concerned had been met, and a perfectly satisfactory agreement come to.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed.

EDUCATION BOARD PROVISIONAL ORDER CONFIRMATION (LONDON) BILL [Lords].

Order read for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [10th July], "That the Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill [Lords] be committed to a Select Committee."—(*Lord Hugh Cecil.*)

Question again proposed—Debate resumed.

LORD HUGH CECIL (Greenwich) said his motion was that this Bill be sent to a Select Committee. The House would be aware that under the ordinary procedure of Provisional Orders there was no possibility of inquiry into the merits of the question involved. The matter, unless petitioned against, went before the Unopposed Bills Committee, and the Order usually came back without Amendment. There was really no inquiry into the merits, nor could there be any inquiry into what were ordinarily considered to be the merits of the Bill, because the petitioners only had a *locus standi* if they were concerned in some injury to private property. Last year a Voluntary school, which thought it would be injured by one of the sites proposed to be established under a similar Bill, petitioned against it, and, after a hearing before the Referee, it was determined that it had no *locus standi*, because it had no property interested in the matter, and there could consequently be no inquiry into the merits of the Bill. Now, the motion he was making would enable the Committee to go into the economic administration of the School Board, and into the question of the necessity of the sites. It was quite possible that a perfect explanation might be forthcoming on those points if his motion were carried, but unless it was agreed to the matter could not be gone into. It was necessary to say that the School Board had adopted a different procedure for the purpose of arriving at the "places" in a school to that adopted by the Board of Education. The Board of Education considered that eight square feet was sufficient accommodation for a child, but the School Board took a higher standard, and said that they would only recognise eleven square feet as sufficient accommodation for a child, so that by a stroke of the pen the space in the schools had been reduced by 30,000 places. In order to cope with that they would have to build thirty schools, each to accommodate 1,000 children, and incur an expenditure of £300,000, because they went beyond what the Education Department considered necessary.

He never contemplated the proceedings of the London School Board without being astonished at their amazing impudence in the way they overruled the decisions of the Department of Education, which they did in a manner certainly not contemplated by the Act. The Vice-President of the Education Department had informed him, in answer to a question, that at the present moment there were being recognised by the Education Department 798,000 school places which actually existed, and 28,000 projected places in schools in course of erection. In addition to that there were sixteen unused sites which the School Board had acquired under compulsory powers and never used, which were kept in reserve for no apparent reason. There was a certain discrepancy between the figures supplied by the Education Department and those furnished by the Report of about 55,000. The School Board had sixteen sites in reserve, and now they came forward for compulsory powers to acquire thirty more sites. Chief Inspector King had called attention to the decreasing number of children between the ages of three and thirteen years attending the schools, and according to the School Board's own reports there had been a diminution in the years 1897, 1898, and 1899 of no less than 8,000. Yet, with this diminishing child population, and with all these places, the School Board proposed to acquire thirty more sites. It was a case for inquiry. They might be necessary, but that would have to be shown. The only reason which could be urged was that the number of children had not decreased really, but had removed to other districts; but if that were so, it was obvious that several City sites, which had been useful, had become useless, and the House ought to be assured that in that case the School Board had made proper provision for the sale of those sites and devoting the money realised to giving the new educational facilities that were necessary. Mr. John Taylor, who had devoted a great deal of time and trouble to investigating the question of sites, pointed out that the Religious Educational Union had successfully opposed the applications of the School Board on various occasions with regard to sites, and had in some cases caused them to be rejected. They further called attention to the extraordinary extravagance with which the matter of sites was carried out. The House was aware the School Board proceeded by dividing London into blocks, and in each block they built a school. Then, if there was insufficiency of accommodation in the school, they applied for power to increase the accommodation. Such a test was unfair. The Education Department should first of all endeavour to find out what proportion of the population desired to go to the schools; then they should take a map of London and measure it off into districts with a compass, and then draw circles over the map showing the radius of each school. If that were done it would be found that the School Board had overestimated the amount of school accommodation demanded to an almost ludicrous degree. If the Bill was sent to a Select Committee there could not fail to be an interesting investigation. It might be that these schools were required, but the School Board was often very extravagant in these matters. London had not complete control over its representatives in this matter, and it was in the highest degree important that London should be well governed locally, and if it could be shown that the School Board did its work extravagantly a considerable service would be done to the country.

Mr. FLOWER (Bradford, W.): In supporting this resolution I propose to take a somewhat different view to the noble Lord who moved. I quite agree with a great deal that has fallen from the noble Lord, but when one remembers that London has 450 schools with an average attendance of half a million children, it will be acknowledged that the problem is one which may fittingly require the very careful consideration of this House. The noble Lord has spoken of the discrepancy between the figures, which may be described as the Return of the School Board, and those supplied by the Education Department. That is undoubtedly proved; and that discrepancy has been caused by the action which the London School Board has taken in what is called writing down the accommodation. With regard to new schools, I think that no one interested in education will object to it, but it is with regard to the older schools that this difficulty has more acutely arisen—more especially with regard to the competition with Voluntary schools, which has brought about an apparent deficiency of school

accommodation in the area covered by the London School Board. Whereas, if it was reckoned on the basis of the accommodation long ago accepted by the Education Department, that deficiency would not exist. I also support this motion on another ground. School boards do not acquire sites in the same way as a railway company or public bodies of that kind. What a school board does is to present to the Education Department generally two or three sites as alternatives. These sites are considered by the Department, and Her Majesty's inspector is sent down by the Department to see into the fitness of the alternatives and to report as to the suitability of one or the other. He is not, I think, authorised or allowed to hold what is called a public inquiry, but I believe that those bodies or individuals who object to particular sites have an opportunity of presenting their views before him. Then the Education Department, or the Board of Education, as it is now called, has to express approval or disapproval of a site, and, if they approve, that site is inserted in the Provisional Order Bill. It is obvious that the cost of opposing the Order Bill in Committee is a very considerable one, and it does seem to me that a somewhat cheaper and more expeditious machinery ought to be devised, by which those who may think themselves injured, either as individuals by reason of their property, or injured as regards the position of the school affecting some Voluntary denominational school in which they are particularly interested, should have an easer, quicker, and cheaper method of placing their views before us. The noble Lord the Member for Greenwich has spoken of those sites which have been "reserved," as it is called, for possible sites for the erection of Board schools which are not now used. He suggested that the School Board for London should sell these sites, but if they did sell them it would be at a very considerable loss. Those sites are the result of reckless scheduling, and unless you can devise some machinery by which this reckless scheduling of sites may be avoided in future, you will be continuously confronted with the same thing. He has spoken also of the migratory character of the London population. That is undoubtedly true. Schools which were erected a few years ago have now been found, if not superfluous, at all events too large for the purpose for which they are intended. I am afraid that it is an evil that will and must continue; but what is possible, I think, is to prevent reckless choosing of sites—choosing them sometimes almost without any regard for the deficiency of school places in the neighbourhood, but with a desire to injure and cripple the work of some Voluntary school. They are sites chosen, not from educational but from sectarian motives. Let us hope that this proposal of my noble friend will prevent the recrudescence of this evil, which under the present Board has assumed gigantic dimensions. I have pleasure in supporting the motion.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL ON EDUCATION (Sir J. GORST, Cambridge University): I wish to let the House know how this Bill stands. The School Boards must have sites, or they cannot carry on their schools. The acquisition of sites is regulated by Acts of Parliament, and what I understand the noble Lord to desire is a revision of the various Acts which regulate the acquisition of sites by School Boards. To that the Board of Education could have no objection whatever, but I think it is better to initiate such an inquiry at the beginning rather than at the end of the session. If we were to refer this Bill to a Select Committee now, at any rate, we would lose the Bill for this session, because it is quite impossible to get hon. Members to attend a Select Committee, and to report upon a matter of this kind before the end of the session. Therefore what I would suggest to my noble friend is to withdraw the motion to-day, and in the next session he should move for an inquiry of this kind, and, as far as I am concerned and the Board of Education is concerned, we will throw no impediment in the way whatever, and if the Committee should report in favour of a change in the law we will give every facility to let a Bill pass through Parliament. I do not say that the law as it at present stands might not be improved. I do not know that there are any laws in existence which are not capable of some amendment, but a matter of this kind is not carried out quite as rapidly as the noble Lord supposes. The Board of Education is entrusted with a very important duty, and that is not to allow school boards in

any place—not only in London, but in every other part of the country—to build a new school until the necessity for it is made out, and for that purpose inquiry is always made before the sanction of the Education Department is given to the building of a new school. London is a very difficult place to deal with in matters of that kind. As the noble Lord has pointed out, there is no doubt that under the present system in London there are far more than enough school places for the children to be accommodated, but London unfortunately is a very large place, with a shifting population, and it is no use whatever if there is a deficiency of accommodation in Battersea to say that there is more than enough in Whitechapel. Generally speaking, it may be said that the population of London is diminishing with some rapidity at the centre; but on the other hand it is growing with enormous rapidity in Battersea, Hackney, and Peckham, and indeed all the parts which surround London. These are the places where workmen are going, and provision has to be made for the education of their children. The Board of Education have considered this difficult matter, and what it does is to divide London proper into blocks. For example, one of the blocks is bounded by Oxford Street and High Holborn on the north, Farringdon Street on the east, Fleet Street and the Strand on the south, and Charing Cross Road on the west. There is another block even more familiar to Members of the House bounded by Oxford Street on the north, Piccadilly on the south, Regent Street on the East, and Park Lane on the west. In the same way the whole of London is divided into blocks of this kind. What the London School Board does is to make out a petition stating that in one of these blocks it can prove that there is not sufficient accommodation for primary education of the children, and that there is a case for building, but even then further inquiry is made. Having ascertained that there is a deficiency in one block, inquiry is made how far it can be made up from superfluous accommodation in an adjoining block. I think it will be quite obvious to the House that it would be a very foolish thing for children south of Oxford Street to go for accommodation to schools north of Oxford Street. Nobody would say that it is desirable for children to traverse that great thoroughfare when going to school; but in places where there is only a moderate amount of traffic on the boundary children may be allowed to go from one block, where there is deficient accommodation, to another block where there is superfluous accommodation. These inquiries are made before a new site is scheduled in a Bill, and no action is taken until the Board of Education has arrived at a satisfactory conclusion in the matter. It has to be fairly made out that there are children without school accommodation, and that no accommodation can be provided for them in the block in which they live, or in an adjoining block. I think to ask the House of Commons at the very end of a session to stop a Bill which is being carried out in accordance with the law, and entirely in accordance with unbroken custom, for the purpose of beginning what could only be an abortive inquiry, would be rather a strong thing for the noble Lord to insist upon. I hope this Bill will go in the ordinary way to the Private Bill Committee, before whom the people who object to two of the sites can be heard. The Private Bill Committee will inquire whether the Board of Education has been justified in authorising any site at all. I can promise the noble Lord that in the next session of Parliament I, at all events, will be only too glad to assist him in having the whole system of the legal provision of school sites inquired into, and if there is any way in which it can be better carried out, I hope the Committee will report to Parliament what they think should be done.

LORD HUGH CECIL: I understand that the Government are prepared to promise that there will be a full inquiry if I ask it at the beginning of next session. That is an exceedingly valuable concession which I asked in vain four years ago. I think, therefore, it will be unnecessary to press this motion.

SIR J. GORST: I have no authority on behalf of the Government to make such a promise. All I said was that I would assist the noble Lord if he asked for an inquiry next session.

LORD HUGH CECIL: I understood that my right hon. friend spoke on behalf of the Board of Education, which represents the Government in this matter, and

after what he has said I will, with the permission of the House, withdraw my motion.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Bill committed.

*MR. CAUSTON (Southwark, W.): I am sorry to have to detain the House for a few minutes, but I wish to move, "that it be an Instruction to the Committee to leave out Plan No. 41 in the schedule." The noble Lord the Member for Greenwich said just now it was customary for this Bill to pass through the House without opposition, but I find the only course open to me in order to carry out the object I have in view is to move this resolution. The plan I desire to have omitted is that enabling the London School Board to carry out alterations and additions to the Belvedere Place Board School, situated in the parish of St. George-the-Martyr, Southwark, the constituency I have the honour to represent. The school is one of the oldest of the London Board schools, and I am far from saying it could not be improved. That I am quite prepared to admit at once, but the Vestry of St. George-the-Martyr, the local authority of the district, altogether object to the plan suggested, and desire the scheme to stand over for further considerations. The objections I wish to enforce to the scheme are these: no further accommodation for additional children is required; the school is large enough to accommodate the children of the particular locality. It is a badly situated school, being under a railway arch, and therefore very noisy. In any case the area proposed to be taken is the wrong one. It is proposed to secure an area of 15,370 square feet, to pull down seventeen houses, to dishouse 230 persons belonging to the labouring classes in a neighbourhood where there is a great demand for workmen's dwellings, and under the existing law no provision will have to be made for rehousing those people. If twenty houses had been taken under the existing law it would have been absolutely necessary to provide accommodation for the whole of the dispossessed occupants, but as only seventeen houses are taken that necessity is avoided. I am not saying that in the part of London I represent further school accommodation is not necessary; but if such further accommodation is necessary, it is not necessary to have it in this particular school. At the present moment 200 or 300 children are located in a temporary school some distance from this one, and the Vestry of St. George-the Martyr say that if it is necessary to have further accommodation, it should be in a new school on a different site, and on a site to which only two or three years ago the Board were giving consideration. The houses which are being taken down contain at present 230 persons; they are very substantially and well built; the rents are satisfactory; the sanitary arrangements are good; and the inhabitants would have very great difficulty in finding any similar suitable accommodation in the district. I am asked that this scheme should stand over until next year, and I may be asked if I have any alternative plan to suggest if that course is adopted. I have. The area now proposed to be taken covers nearly 15,400, and has a rateable value of £387. There is an adjoining piece of land which comes into the Borough Road, having upon it five shops in the Borough Road and a house and yard in Belvedere Place, and a tram shed, the area of which is 13,750 square feet, with a rateable value of only £278. The right hon. Gentleman the Vice-President has said that this Bill is going to a Committee of the House as there is opposition to it. Only one petition has been presented against the Bill, and that is the petition of the Vestry of St. George-the-Martyr. The Bill therefore, will go through as unopposed if the House will agree that this plan should be withdrawn for the present year. The managers of the school are all favourable to the alternative site, while, at the worst, it would only mean the deferring of the alternative for a year, and in the meantime I am sure the School Board and the Education Department would come to the conclusion that the alternative site is really the better. My plan is a very simple, just, and common-sense plan. This is not a party question, and therefore I may appeal to hon. Members on the other side, as well as to those on this, to support my motion. I beg to move.

LORD HUGH CECIL formally seconded the motion.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That it be an Instruction to the Committee on the Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill [Lords] to leave out Plan No. 41 in the Schedule."—(*Mr. Causton.*)

MR. FLOWER said that the speech of the mover of the motion had very aptly illustrated the value of the discussion on the motion of the noble Lord the hon. Member for Greenwich. It was quite impossible for the House as a House to determine the merits of the respective sites. It was beyond the comprehension even of Members acquainted with the district, and it was obviously altogether outside the limits of fair play for the hon. Gentleman to attempt at the eleventh hour to get a particular site adopted. The mover of the motion had secured the valuable support of the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich, and he trusted those Gentlemen would mutually support an improved process in the future for dealing with these questions. This site should be considered by a Committee in the ordinary way. As to the necessity for school accommodation, about which the hon. Member for West Southwark spoke with some diffidence, Her Majesty's Inspector, so far back as March, 1896, was disposed to think the best course would be enlargement of the Belvedere Place School in accordance with the proposal of the divisional Member, the divisional Member being the member of the London School Board for that part of London. The inspector also suggested certain improvements and amendments, which were provided for in the plan now proposed. An alternative site was very carefully considered, and rejected by both the divisional Member and the School Accommodation Committee of the London School Board. The hon. Member had endeavoured to enlist sympathy on that side of the House by stating that the scheme would dispossess 230 persons, and that the School Board would be under no statutory obligation to rehouse. But as a result of a decision of last year, it would be open to the Committee to insist upon the rehousing of the dispossessed persons, even though less than twenty houses were taken. There were many points in connection with the site to which reference might be made, but the House could rest satisfied that the matter had engaged the careful attention of the School Board, and having received the approval of the Board of Education, it might fittingly be allowed to pass.

SIR J. GORST, in opposing the motion, said the case of St. George the Martyr had already been heard by the Board of Education. The Vestry were not satisfied with the decision, and petitioned the House of Lords, but with no better success.

MR. CAUSTON pointed out that when the Vestry went before the House of Lords they were told they had no *locus standi* as a vestry, but they could be heard as owners of property.

MR. J. GORST said that, in whatever capacity they appeared, they were, as a matter of fact, heard, and the House of Lords decided that no case was made out for the alteration of the site. If any injustice were done when the matter went before the Committee, the hon. Member would have an opportunity on consideration for bringing the matter forward, and he therefore hoped the motion would be rejected.

*MR. CAUSTON: I only wish it to be made perfectly clear that we have a *locus standi* before the Committee of this House. Certainly we had no *locus standi* in the House of Lords. In the case referred to by the right hon. Gentleman, the learned counsel was under a misapprehension when he informed the Committee of the House of Lords that there had been a local inquiry, because there has not been a local inquiry. I shall divide the House now and take my chance in Committee.

Question put and negatived.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS [Lords] (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz.:—

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time To-morrow.

HAMILTON, MOTHERWELL, AND WISHAW TRAMWAYS BILL.

Lords Amendments considered and agreed to, with an Amendment.

LEE CONSERVANCY BILL.

NORTH METROPOLITAN RAILWAY AND CANAL BILL.

Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

FALKIRK AND DISTRICT WATER BILL [Lords].

Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

WESTGATE AND BIRCHINGTON WATER BILL [Lords].

Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

DEARNE VALLEY RAILWAY BILL [Lords].

Not amended, considered; to be read the third time.

GLYNCORRWG URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL GAS BILL [Lords].

LONDON SEA WATER SUPPLY BILL [Lords].

As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

WHITECHAPEL AND BOW RAILWAY BILL [Lords].

As amended, considered; an Amendment made; Bill to be read the third time.

LANCASHIRE ELECTRIC POWER BILL. (BY ORDER.)

As amended, considered.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed.

CALEDONIAN RAILWAY BILL [Lords].

MORLEY CORPORATION BILL [Lords].

SOUTH EASTERN AND LONDON, CHATHAM, AND DOVER RAILWAYS BILL [Lords].

Read a second time, and committed.

NORTH METROPOLITAN ELECTRIC POWER SUPPLY BILL. (BY ORDER.)

Ordered, That, in the case of the North Metropolitan Electric Power Supply Bill, Standing Orders 84, 214, and 239 be suspended, and that the Bill be now taken into consideration, provided amended prints shall have been previously deposited.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Bill, as amended, considered accordingly; to be read the third time.

GAS PROVISIONAL ORDER (No. 3) BILL.

Lords Amendment considered, and agreed to.

GAS ORDERS CONFIRMATION (No. 1) BILL [Lords].

Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

WATER ORDERS CONFIRMATION BILL [Lords].

Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

EDINBURGH (HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES) IMPROVEMENT SCHEME PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

PAISLEY WATERWORKS PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

Read a second time, and committed.

STANDING ORDERS.

Resolutions reported from the Committee:—

1. "That, in the case of the Workington Railways and Docks Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with, on condition that the powers contained in Clause 131 to the London and North-Western Railway Company be struck out of the Bill, and that the powers to the Cleator and Workington Junction Railway Company be also struck out of the Bill, unless it be proved before the Committee to whom the Bill is referred that the Bill has been submitted to and approved by the last-named company:—That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."

2. "That, in the case of the Crystal Palace Company Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with:—That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill."

3. "That, in the case of the Military Manœuvres Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought not to be dispensed with."

First two Resolutions agreed to.

Report to lie upon the Table.

CRYSTAL PALACE COMPANY BILL [Lords].

Report [this day] from the Select Committee on Standing Orders read.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

WORKINGTON RAILWAYS AND DOCKS BILL [Lords].

Report [this day] from the Select Committee on Standing Orders read.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

MOTHERWELL AND BELLSHILL RAILWAY BILL [Lords].

Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

ROTHERHITHE AND RATCLIFF TUNNEL BILL [Lords].

Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to Amendments to —Edinburgh District Lunacy Board Bill [Lords], Falkirk Corporation Bill [Lords], Rhymney Railway Bill [Lords], Cork Electric Tramways Bill [Lords], without amendment.

That they have passed a Bill intituled, "An Act to authorise the sale of the chattels bequeathed and settled by the will and codicils of the late Sir William Augustus Fraser, Bart., deceased, and to declare the trusts of the proceeds of such sale; and for other purposes." Fraser Settled Chattels Bill [Lords].

FRASER SETTLED CHATTELS BILL [Lords].

Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

PETITIONS.

MILITARY MANŒUVRES BILL.

Petition of Belfast City and District Water Commissioners against dispensing with the Standing Orders; Referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

Petition from Langley Moor, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (No. 2) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Twickenham (two); and Langley Moor; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Kelton; and Stornoway; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

MINT.

Copy presented, of Thirtieth Annual Report of the Deputy Master of the Mint, 1899 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PUBLIC WORKS LOAN BOARD.

Copy presented, of Twenty-fifth Annual Report (for 1899-1900), with Appendices [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 274.]

SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1887.

Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 6th July, 1900, granting to Mr. T. G. Pinches, First Class Assistant at the British Museum, a Retired Allowance under the Act [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

EAST INDIA (ACCOUNTS AND ESTIMATES, 1900-1901).

Copy presented, of Explanatory Memorandum by the Secretary of State for India [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

SOUTH AFRICA.

Copy presented, of Further Correspondence relating to Affairs in South Africa [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

POLLING DISTRICTS (WEST RIDING OF YORKSHIRE).

Copy presented, of Order made by the County Council of the West Riding of Yorkshire constituting Polling Districts and Polling Places in the Parliamentary Divisions of Shipley, Sowerby, and Colne Valley [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION ACT, 1889.

Copy presented, of Minute sanctioning the Subjects to be taught under Clause 8

of the Act, for the County Borough of Oldham (Seventh Minute), dated 2nd July, 1900 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

RAILWAY RETURNS.

Copy presented, of Return as to the Capital, Traffic Receipts, and Working Expenditure, &c., of the Railway Companies of the United Kingdom for the year 1899 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRAMWAYS ORDERS CONFIRMATION (No. 4) BILL.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 13th July; *Mr. Ritchie*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 275.]

MERCHANT SEAMEN'S FUND.

Account presented, of the Receipts and Expenditure under the Seamen's Fund Winding-up Act from 1st January to 31st December, 1899 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 276.]

NAVY (COURTS MARTIAL).

Copy presented, of Return of the number of Courts Martial held and Summary Punishments inflicted during the year 1899 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT, 1897 (ARMY AND NAVY SERVICE) (MEN EMPLOYED).

Return presented, relative thereto [Address 14th June; *Mr. Woods*]; to lie upon the Table.

MEDICAL AND SANITARY ARRANGEMENTS AT THE CAPE.

Return presented, relative thereto [Address 10th July; *Sir James Kitson*]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS.

CHINA—ANTI-FOREIGN OUTBREAK—RECENT NEWS—REPORTED GENERAL MASSACRE OF EUROPEANS IN PEKING—POSITION AT TIENTSIN AND TA-KU.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): I beg to ask whether the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs has any information to communicate on the subject of China; and not only as to events there, but as to the course which the Government proposes to take in regard to them.

*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): Although no positive information has reached us of the terrible calamity of which details have appeared in the public press this morning, we can hardly, I fear, dare to hope that in substance the accounts of the massacres in Peking are erroneous. Consul General Warren at Shanghai telegraphed yesterday evening that he learnt from a well-informed Chinese source that cannon were believed to have been fired on the Legations on the 8th of July, a massacre ensuing, the object being to effect an irreparable breach with foreigners. Official confirmation of this report was wanting, but Her Majesty's Consul General feared it to be true. The following telegrams have been received from Brigadier General Dorward, in command of Her Majesty's military forces at Tientsin—

"Tientsin, 10th July.—Yesterday, 3 a.m., combined force 1,000 Japanese under the command of General Fokosima, 550 British troops, 400 British navy, 100 United States, 400 Russians under command of myself attacked enemy's position south-west of city. Positions were quickly captured. Enemy's loss 350 killed, four small guns (? captured). Combined force then attacked Western Arsenal outside South Gate, which, after a short bombardment, was rushed by United States and Japanese. Country to the west of Arsenal had been flooded by enemy, so no further movement in this direction was possible. Chief object of expedition, which was to clear away guns and enemy to the west of settlements, completely carried out. Day's honours rested with Japanese and Americans; Chinese regiment as escort to guns worked splendidly, getting over difficulties of swampy country. During the action British and French settlements heavily shelled by north-eastern batteries. Following casualties reported in action:—2nd Royal Welsh Fusiliers, 3644 Private Porter; Royal Marine Light Infantry, one private; one Chinese hospital attendant killed in action. Lieutenant Phayre, R.A., three men, 2nd Royal Welsh Fusiliers, one seaman, one man Chinese regiment, one Chinese hospital attendant wounded. No casualties amongst Russians and Americans. Following casualties reported during bombardment:—2nd Royal Welsh Fusiliers, 4034 Private Porter, one seaman killed in action. Three men, one seaman wounded. Yesterday's victory may result in withdrawal of Chinese troops from Tientsin, in which case fort and city will probably be attacked soon."

The following telegram shows that that opinion, however, was not justified :—

"Tientsin, 11th July.—Three o'clock this morning, determined attack made by enemy on railway station, which is garrisoned by 100 British troops, 100 French, 100 Japanese. Attack repulsed with loss after four hours hard fighting; enemy's loss 500 killed; our loss, Hong Kong Regiment, 3 men killed 9 wounded; 2nd Battalion Welsh Fusiliers, 1 wounded; Royal Marine Light Infantry, 3 wounded; Royal Navy, 3 wounded. French and Japanese losses considerably heavier."

We have also had a telegram to the effect that Vice-Admiral Seymour has returned to his ship, leaving at Tientsin only a sufficient number of the Naval Brigade to work the guns there. In a telegram, dated Ta-ku, 14th July, the Admiral states that he believes the allied forces have taken possession of every fort at Tientsin except one. It may be interesting to the House to know what forces are at Ta-ku. According to a telegram from Rear-Admiral Bruce at Ta-ku, dated 11th July, the total of the allied forces landed and landing on the 10th July was about 20,700 men, composed as follows :—

	Officers.	Men.
Russia	149	8,200
Japan	124	5,100
British	175	2,400
French	103	2,400
German	36	1,087
American	10	1,305
Italian, Austrian	Small detachments.	

Thus there are 604 officers and 20,700 men. The House is probably aware that considerable forces are now landed or are on their way, but the facilities for landing at Ta-ku are limited, and therefore the reinforcements cannot be landed as quickly as they arrive. I do not think I have any further information to give the House.

MEASURES TAKEN FOR SAFETY OF PEKING LEGATIONS.

MR. MACLEAN (Cardiff): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has any information to the effect of the statement made by Count von Bülow, German Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, in his circular note, that up to 10th June the English Minister at Peking, in agreement with the late Baron von Ketteler, considered the personal safety of members of the Legations had been sufficiently secured by the measures already adopted; and can he state on what date Admiral Seymour was summoned to commence his march to Peking.

*MR. BRODRICK: Guards for the Legations were sent for on 27th May, and although the position was not free from anxiety, the first intimation of imminent danger to the Legations is contained in a telegram from Sir C. MacDonald of 4th June. He stated that the position was such that they might be besieged at any time with the railway and telegraph lines cut, and he asked that, should this happen, instructions might be sent to Admiral Seymour to concert measures for their relief with the officers commanding the various squadrons at Ta-ku. Her Majesty's Government gave Admiral Seymour unfettered discretion on 6th June to act in concert with other Powers, and he landed a force on 9th June. On 10th June, Sir C. MacDonald telegraphed to Admiral Seymour urging an immediate advance which had been in fact already commenced.

MR. MACLEAN: Is there anything definite from Sir C. MacDonald up to 10th June as to the safety of the Legations?

[No answer was given.]

COMMUNICATIONS WITH THE CHINESE GOVERNMENT.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the despatch which has reached Her Majesty's Government purporting to come from the Emperor of China was handed to the Government by the Chinese Ambassador in the ordinary course; and when the Government will communicate the contents of that despatch to the House of Commons.

*MR. BRODRICK: The despatch was received from the Chinese Minister in the ordinary course. It will be laid with the Papers.

COMMAND OF ALLIED FORCES.

MR. DILLON: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether there is any General in supreme command of the allied forces at Tientsin; and, if not, whether any communications have passed between the Powers as to the appointment of a Commander-in-Chief.

*MR. BRODRICK: The instructions given by Her Majesty's Government to the senior naval and military officers on the spot are to arrange all matters in concert with the commanding officers of the forces of other Powers. Communications are passing between the Powers on various points, but we are not in telegraphic communication with Tientsin, and I cannot make any further statement at present.

MR. DILLON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether Her Majesty's Government has sanctioned any proposal to put the allied forces at Tientsin under the command of a Japanese general officer.

*MR. BRODRICK: No, Sir; nor has any such proposal yet been made.

CHINA PAPERS.

MR. DILLON: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he can state when the China Papers will be laid upon the Table of the House?

*MR. BRODRICK: They are being prepared as quickly as possible, but I cannot name any day at present. They will be laid in time for discussion before the Foreign Office Vote is taken.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL ARRANGEMENTS—COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, having regard to the criticism to which the appointment of Professor Cunningham to be a member of the South African Hospitals Commission has been subject, he will now state to the House the grounds on which Professor Cunningham was recommended for the appointment by Sir William MacCormac and by Dr. Jameson, the head of the Army Medical Department, whose administration in South Africa will be the subject of investigation.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I have nothing to add to what I have already told the hon. Gentleman on this subject; but I do not admit the basis of fact which he has assumed in putting the question.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Pardon me, it is no assumption.

SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston): Can the right hon. Gentleman announce the names of the two additional members of the Commission?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am very sorry that so much delay has occurred. No one deplores it more than I do; but I hope to be able to make a statement tomorrow.

DESPATCHES.

CAPTAIN SINCLAIR (Forfarshire): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he is now prepared to state when the despatches relating to the following operations in South Africa will be published, namely, the action at Paardeberg, the advance to Bloemfontein, the siege and relief of Ladysmith, and the further operations in Cape Colony and Natal.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: As, I think, I indicated, there are difficulties in the way of publishing these despatches at present, but I hope that the delay will not be very long.

CAPTAIN SINCLAIR: Before the Supplementary Estimate comes on?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I believe not.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: When they are published, will the right hon. Gentleman undertake that they shall be published as written, and shall not be re-edited as the Magersfontein despatch was?

[No answer was given.]

TRANSPORT RETURN.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty, having regard to the fact that the Transport Return (South Africa) was ordered on 6th February last, presented on 21st May, and ordered to be printed on 22nd May, will he explain why its issue to Members is so long delayed.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. MACARTNEY, Antrim, S.): I regret that there has been any delay in the production of this voluminous Return, involving the accurate checking of many details. The Return is now complete and will be in the hands of Members in a few days.

MINISTERIAL CRISIS IN CAPE COLONY.

CAPTAIN SINCLAIR: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, having regard to the importance of the subject, and especially to the varying accounts thereof, he will now lay before Parliament Papers explaining the recent Ministerial crisis in Cape Colony, including any communications which have passed between Her Majesty's Government and the Government of Cape Colony.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): Yes, Sir.

MARTIAL LAW—ARREST OF MR. JACOBUS BOTHA.

SIR WILFRID LAWSON (Cumberland, Cockermouth): On behalf of the hon. Baronet the Member for the Northwich Division of Cheshire, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether Mr. Jacobus Botha, a Member of the Cape Parliament, was arrested at Cape Town on 26th June without a warrant; and, if so, by whose authority the arrest was made; whether an application was made by him, and to what court, for his unconditional release from arrest, and whether that application was refused; whether he has been admitted to bail only on condition of taking his trial at Aliwal North; whether Aliwal North is one of the districts where martial law was in force; and whether he is to be tried by a court martial or by what tribunal.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I am informed by Sir A. Milner as follows (in reply to a telegraphic inquiry): Botha was arrested for high treason at Cape Town on date mentioned, on warrant signed by resident magistrate Aliwal North. He applied unsuccessfully to magistrate Cape Town, and subsequently to Supreme Court, for release from arrest, but was afterwards admitted to bail by the latter on condition that he should return to Aliwal North and remain there during his preparatory examination, which is now being held there by civil authorities. Case will probably come for trial in due course before Special Commission. Aliwal North is a district under martial law.

MARTIAL LAW IN CAPE COLONY.

MR. BUCHANAN (Aberdeenshire, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies, since what date, in the districts of Cape Colony where martial law was proclaimed, have the military courts ceased to take cognisance of offences, other than those committed by soldiers, against the Criminal Law of the Colony.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I understand that since the middle of April no fresh trials for treasonable offences by the military courts have taken place—only preliminary investigations. This is all the information I have.

COURT MARTIAL PUNISHMENTS.

MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN (Montgomeryshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether persons sentenced by courts martial in the Cape Colony to terms of imprisonment or penal servitude are detained in civil or in military prisons; and, if they are detained in civil prisons, whether the warrants are signed by civil or by military officers.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I have no information. The question should be addressed to the War Office.

CIVIL SURGEONS AT THE FRONT.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if he can state the number of civil surgeons whose services have been accepted since the outbreak of hostilities in South Africa for the field hospitals and base hospitals, and the number of civil surgeons who are at present employed in these hospitals, and how many Army medical officers within two years from their entrance into the Army Medical Service have been sent to the war in South Africa; whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that of ninety-eight Army medical officers who are liable to be recalled to service, four only are employed in South Africa or in hospital ships, and that although many of them have requested to be sent to the seat of war their offers were refused; whether the authorities at the War Office are aware that the sending of Army medical officers without previous experience in campaigns, and the recognition of the services of civil surgeons while the services of retired Army medical officers have been rejected, has led to discontent and a feeling that the medical treatment of the troops will be wholly subordinate to purely military considerations; and will he cause inquiries to be made in the matter.

*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): The services of 385 civil surgeons have been accepted, principally for base hospitals and general duty; of these 363 are now in South Africa. This does not include those locally employed, or attached to private hospitals or to the Yeomany or the Rhodesian Field Force. One hundred and seventeen Royal Army Medical Corps officers under two years' service have been sent out. Of the ninety-eight officers liable to recall, as has been already stated, eighteen hold permanent military appointments at home, and very few volunteered for service in South Africa. Nothing is known of any general discontent to which the hon. Gentleman refers.

FEVER AT LADYSMITH.

SIR WALTER FOSTER: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if his attention has been called to the statement that there have been 6,000 cases of typhoid fever among the troops at Ladysmith since the relief of that place; and if he can give the number of admissions to hospital for typhoid fever, and the number of deaths from that disease in the forces under General Buller for the twelve weeks ending 25th May.

*MR. WYNDHAM: I have no knowledge of the statement put forward, and I have complete Returns for the Ladysmith garrison only up to 18th May. The cases of enteric at Ladysmith from the date of the relief to the week ending 18th May amount to 799. Including the above the total admissions for all the forces in Natal during the twelve weeks ending 25th May were 2,380, and the deaths 550.

TREATMENT OF DISCHARGED SOLDIERS—CASE OF ROBERT WEIR.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if he will state on what grounds has the conclusion been formed that the mental infirmity of private Robert Weir, of the Royal Inniskilling Fusiliers, who, on his return from the war in South Africa, was transferred from Netley to the workhouse at Enniskillen, where he is now a pauper inmate, was not due to the horrors and privations of the campaign in Natal through which he served with his regiment; and, seeing that Weir would be entitled to a pension if his mental infirmity was due to his services in the Army, can he say by whom was the judgment formed that his madness was not directly or indirectly caused by these services, and to what supervision or control was that judgment subject.

*MR. WYNDHAM: This man became insane on the passage out, and twice tried to jump overboard; he was disembarked at Cape Town, and kept under supervision there for two months, and was then invalided home. Upon these facts the medical officer in charge of the hospital at Cape Town formed the opinion that Weir's madness was not the result of the campaign in Natal; that opinion was confirmed by several medical officers through whose hands the man passed, and finally by the Commissioners of Chelsea Hospital.

CASUALTY RETURNS.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War what explanation, if any, has the War Office to give for the circumstances that the death of Sergeant G. French, of the Royal Warwick Regiment, which occurred at Bloemfontein on 26th May, and the death in the same place of Private Martin, of the same regiment, on 31st May, were not published by the War Office till 12th July; and can he say why have the families of these two soldiers, who died presumably in hospital at Pretoria, not been apprised of their deaths for nearly two months.

*MR. WYNDHAM: The information was not received by the War Office until Sunday, the 8th July, and after the usual verification was published on the 10th July.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Has the hon. Gentleman any reason to give for the long delay?

*MR. WYNDHAM: The hon. Member must be aware that it is only by means of a very elaborate system of triplicate returns that we are able to get the information we do at such an early date.

IRISH MILITIAMEN AND THE HARVEST.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the inconvenience and loss that may result to Ire-

land by having the Irish Militia Regiments in England while their labour is needed during the harvest in Ireland, he will consider the desirability of either disbanding them or giving them leave to return to Ireland to assist at the harvesting.

*MR. WYNDHAM: Instructions were issued on the 6th June to the general officers commanding in the United Kingdom that militiamen belonging to units embodied before the 6th March might be given furlough if they had satisfactorily completed their training and could be spared. The Secretary of State would have been glad to assent to a more general release of the Militia, both in the interests of the men themselves and in view of the widespread demand for labour, but, having regard to present circumstances, he has come to the conclusion that general leave or disembodiment would be inexpedient.

CHELSEA HOSPITAL GARDEN.

MR. MASSEY-MAINWARING (Finsbury, Central): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if he will state by whose orders the garden of the Chelsea pensioners was lately closed at 8 p.m. instead of 9 p.m.; by whose orders this garden has been closed at 8.30 p.m. this week; and why the hour fixed for closing between the 10th June and 10th July, which has existed for many years, was altered, and at whose suggestion.

MR. WYNDHAM: The gardens were closed at an earlier hour than usual by orders of the Lieutenant Governor and Secretary of the hospital to prevent disorderly conduct which, it appears, had been taking place in the dusk.

ARMY LANCES—SERGEANT CARTWRIGHT'S CLAIM.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether his attention has been called to an application from Sergeant Cartwright, late of the 16th Lancers, for some monetary recognition for his services in connection with his exhibition with the lance before a committee of generals; and whether, considering the fact that he was informed that upon his performance depended the retention of the lance in the Army, and taking into account the fact that Sergeant Cartwright was promised a commission, he will consider whether it would be possible to accede to his request and make some allowance to him for the services rendered.

*THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Mr. J. POWELL-WILLIAMS, Birmingham, S.): There are no records in the War Office showing that any promise of a commission was made to Sergeant Cartwright or which corroborate other statements made in the question. The Secretary of State for War has fully considered Sergeant Cartwright's application, and is not prepared to grant it.

NAVAL CONSTRUCTION—INFLAMMABLE WOODWORK.

MR. PROVAND (Glasgow, Blackfriars): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he is aware that as a result of the experience gained in the war between China and Japan, and in the war between the United States and Spain, the woodwork in all men-of-war lately built and now building for the United States Government is made of non-flammable timber; whether he is also aware that the Russian Government are having men-of-war built in the United States in which all the woodwork is non-flammable; and can he say whether the wood used in vessels at present under construction for the British Government is rendered non-flammable.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. GOSCHEN, St. George's, Hanover Square): The term "lately built" is indefinite. The woodwork for all men-of-war building for the United States Government will be non-flammable, armour backing and battens for electric wires excepted. Two ships are building for Russia in the United States. We have no special information on this point relative to these ships, but in all Russian ships now building orders have been given to use non-flammable wood for certain purposes. Wood not specially treated is to be still largely used. The use of non-flammable wood has been provided for in the specifications for several ships now under construction, but it has since been found to involve certain serious disadvantages, and further orders have been suspended until the best way of overcoming these difficulties has been ascertained by further experience.

AUSTRALIAN COMMONWEALTH — FIRST GOVERNOR GENERAL — OFFICIAL RESIDENCE.

MR. HOGAN (Tipperary, Mid): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies when the nomination of the first Governor General of the Australian Commonwealth may be expected, and whether the official residence of the Governor General is to be located at Sydney pending the establishment of the permanent Federal capital.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The hon. Member will have seen from the announcement in the press on the 14th instant that Her Majesty has approved the selection of the Earl of Hopetoun as the first Governor General. The question of the Governor General's residence is the subject of communications now passing with the Colonies.

INDIAN AND AUSTRALIAN MAILS.

MR. HOGAN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether, owing to the under-staffing and various other causes, considerable quantities of Indian and Australian mails have recently failed to catch the steamers for which they were intended.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. HANBURY, Preston): On several recent occasions it has not been practicable to include all the printed matter for India and Australia in the mails for which it was intended; but no letters have on any occasion been left behind. Several causes have contributed to the delay. The public have the habit of leaving the posting of their Indian and Australian correspondence to the very last moment—that is to say, till Friday evening; and the work has been enormously increased of late on that evening by the large number of letters and newspapers posted for the troops in South Africa. Further, there has not been room at the General Post Office for an adequate staff of men to deal with the outgoing foreign mails. Now that the provincial work of the United Kingdom has been removed to Mount Pleasant, steps are being taken to increase the staff at the General Post Office, and it is hoped that by this means the irregularity to which the Hon. Member refers will be remedied. This end, however, would still be the more easily attained if the public would post as much of their Indian and Australian correspondence as possible earlier in the week.

MR. HOGAN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether the Continental railways that carry the Australian mails are liable to any penalty for needless delays caused by carlessness and inefficiency in their working arrangements; and, if not, whether the propriety of inserting such a provision in future contracts will be taken into consideration.

MR. HANBURY: I assume that the hon. Member is referring to the Australian mails landed at Naples. The Postmaster General has no relations with the Italian and French railway companies which convey those mails; and he has no information as to the arrangements existing between them and their respective Governments. The payment for the transit of those mails is made to the Italian and French post offices, and is regulated by the Postal Convention of Washington. I understand that the inward mail from Naples is paid for by the Australian Government, who are content with the ordinary train service, whereas the English Government, deem it necessary to have a special train for the outward mail.

ASHANTI—NATIVE RISING — INVESTMENT OF COOMASSIE.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies what progress has been made by the Coomassie relief column; and will he state what number of persons escaped from the fort with the governor, and how many reached Cape Coast Castle.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: According to the latest information, Colonel Willcocks was at Bekwai, about twenty miles from Coomassie, on the 12th instant. It will be seen, on reference to the telegrams from Sir. F. Hodgson which were published in the newspapers on the 7th and 10th instant, that the column which left Coomassie was 600 strong, including twenty-six Europeans, and was accompanied by 700 carriers, and that on the way to the coast seven men were killed, and two officers and some more men died of their wounds or were missing. The exact number of those who reached Cape Coast is not stated.

INDIA FAMINE—ADVANCES TO LAND CULTIVATORS.

MR BUCHANAN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India what are the conditions laid down by the Government of India under which advances are made to the cultivators in the famine districts for restocking their farms; and whether such advances are by gift or by loan, and, if by loan, what are the conditions of repayment, and what is the total amount hitherto advanced or promised by the Government of India for that purpose.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord G. HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): The general conditions of Government advances to cultivators, for the restocking of their farms are (1) that they are to be free of interest; (2) that the first instalment of repayment will not be demanded for at least twelve months; (3) that the local governments may hereafter grant remissions in respect of these advances, thus converting them into gifts, according to the circumstances of the recipients. According to the last advices, the sum allotted by Government for these advances was £820,000. The hon. Member is of course aware that a large part of the charitable fund raised by subscription has been devoted to this same purpose.

ST. PETERSBURG HERRING TRADE.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether Her Majesty's Ambassador at St. Petersburg has yet been able to secure improved facilities for the discharge and storage of herrings at that port.

*MR. BRODRICK: Her Majesty's Ambassador at St. Petersburg was informed by the Russian Government in September last that arrangements had been made for the erection of the buildings and execution of the works which were urgently needed for the discharge and storage of herrings at that port. No further complaints of defective accommodation have been received since that date.

TEACHERS' SUPERANNUATION IN THE CHANNEL ISLANDS AND THE ISLE OF MAN.

*MR. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he has been able to arrange to introduce the non-contentious Bill, involving no charge on the Imperial Exchequer, extending the Teachers' Superannuation Act to the Isle of Man and the Channel Isles this session.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Sir M. WHITE RIDLEY, Lancashire, Blackpool): Yes, Sir; I hope to be able to introduce the Bill, or, rather, Bills—one for each island that desires it—to-morrow.

VACCINATION PROSECUTIONS—CASE OF F. J. CHATTING.

MR. LOUIS SINCLAIR (Essex, Romford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that Mr. F. J. Chatting was imprisoned for not paying a fine for non-compliance to an order for vaccination; that the warrant for his arrest was for Pentonville, but that he was taken to West Ham police station, then taken to Stratford police court, and kept without food from 8 a.m. to 8 p.m. on 7th July; and that on his arrival at Pentonville, instead of being treated as a first-class misdemeanant, his clothes were taken from him, and that he was forced to wear a prison suit, and that he was subjected to other treatment which the Act does not permit; and whether he will take such steps as will prevent a recurrence of such proceedings.

*SIR M. WHITE RIDLEY: Chatting was not arrested till about 8.40 p.m. on the 6th. It was then too late to take him to Pentonville, so he was taken to West Ham police station, and thence on the next morning to the police court, in accordance with the ordinary practice, in order that he might go on to Pentonville by the afternoon van. He had breakfast at the station, and might have had lunch at the police court, but on being twice asked whether he wanted anything replied in the negative. At Pentonville the reception officer made a mistake and treated him like an ordinary prisoner. For this mistake he will be duly dealt with by the Prison Commissioners, and it is not one which is likely to recur.

MR. LOUIS SINCLAIR: Is no compensation or apology even to be made to this man?

*SIR M. WHITE RIDLEY: I have not considered the question of compensation.

LONDON SCHOOL BOARD RE-HOUSING SCHEMES.

MR. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether the School Board for London propose to discharge their obligations under their Provisional Confirmation Act of last year to rehouse persons of the labouring class displaced in the neighbourhood of Wood Street, Bethnal Green, by erecting dwellings in Parnell Road, Bow; and, if so, whether, as the proposed dwellings will be useless for the purpose of rehousing the persons so displaced, he will withhold his approval from the scheme.

*SIR M. WHITE RIDLEY: The scheme indicated by the hon. Member forms only a part of proposals which have been laid before me by the London School Board, and are now under my consideration. I cannot yet say whether or not I shall approve them. But as regards the rehousing of the actual persons displaced, I may say that the buildings in Wood Street were demolished more than a year ago.

DORKING RURAL DISTRICT COUNCIL.

MR. CUBITT (Surrey, Reigate): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been called to the fact that on the 23rd ult. the *Dorking Advertiser* contained the copy of a letter sent by the Local Government Board to the Dorking Rural District Council, which that council had previously refused to make public pending further negotiations with the Board; and whether it is the custom of the Board to supply a copy of such letters to anyone who applies for them without reference to the authority to whom they were originally written; and, if not, if he will take steps to deal with the official who was responsible for the disclosure in this case.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. CHAPLIN, Lincolnshire, Sleaford): It is not the custom of the Local Government Board to supply as a matter of course a copy of a letter which they had addressed to a local authority to anyone applying for it. In the present case the letter was one which they had sent to the district council in sanctioning a loan for sewerage, and application for a copy of it was made by a ratepayer, with whom the Board had had some correspondence in connection with the loan. There did not appear to be any sufficient reason for refusing the application. The Board have no information as to the facts referred to in the first paragraph of the question.

DEVIZES PRISON—WARDER HARGRAVE'S PENSION.

MR. GOULDING (Wiltshire, Devizes): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can now state the decision of the Treasury in reference to the pension of Henry Hargrave, late warder of Devizes Prison, and whether the whole of the pension awarded to him by the Treasury should have been apportioned between Imperial and local funds.

MR. HANBURY: The Treasury, in October, 1898, awarded to Hargrave a pension of £44 12s. 2d. on the scale allowed by the Superannuation Act, 1859. In the following month the Home Secretary forwarded to the Treasury a resolution by the late prison authority (the Court of Quarter Sessions of the County of Wilts) asking that the pension might be increased to two-thirds of Hargrave's retiring salary, and stating that they were ready to pay the difference between the pension as already awarded, and the amount of such two-thirds. To this the Treasury assented, and the increased rate asked for was awarded. The Local Government auditor of the county accounts has now reported that the quarter sessions has no power to fulfil their undertaking, and Hargrave can thus receive only the amount of the original award. The words of the Prisons Act, 1877, will not allow the Treasury to pay the excess for which the quarter sessions made themselves responsible. The case of Hargrave and other prison officers whose pensions are affected by this decision appears one of hardship, and I hope that a Bill may be passed early next session giving the local authorities power to pay the excess pension which they have always desired to do.

RAILWAY PASSENGERS' FREE LUGGAGE.

SIR CAMERON GULL (Devon, Barnstaple): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that the Midland Company has given notice

that from an early date the amount of free luggage that will be allowed to passengers will be 150 pounds first class, and 100 pounds third class, and whether he will communicate with the other companies with the view of urging them to adopt a similar limit.

MR. HANBURY (for Mr. RITCHIE): The Board of Trade are in correspondence with the Railway Association on the subject of excess luggage, and will consider the expediency of raising the point made by the hon. Baronet in a subsequent communication to that body. The Board of Trade understand that several other important companies have adopted the increased scale, and it is to be hoped that the example will be followed by others.

MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland): Will the Board of Trade lay upon the table the correspondence up to date?

MR. HANBURY: I will consult my right hon. friend as to that.

PILLAR BOXES IN THE METROPOLIS.

*MR. COHEN (Islington, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if he will state how many pillar letter boxes there are in the metropolitan area; how many of these are divided into two compartments; how many of these latter are within the E.C. district; and, what is the reason persons posting in one part of London are obliged to sort their letters, under pain of having the delivery delayed, while no such obligation is imposed on persons posting in other parts of London.

MR. HANBURY: The number of wall and pillar letter boxes (other than those in use at post offices) in the metropolitan area is 2,988. In the Eastern Central district there are 156 boxes, ninety-nine being pillar and fifty-seven wall boxes. Of the ninety-nine twenty-six have two compartments, and of the fifty-seven twenty-three are double boxes, *i.e.*, two placed side by side and counting as one box. The duplicating arrangement will be extended as rapidly as possible in the Eastern Central district. The reason why it is desired that letters for (1) London and abroad, (2) provinces, should, so far as the Eastern Central District is concerned, be posted separately, is that the two classes of letters are now dealt with in different buildings a mile apart, and that at the busiest parts of the day each class is taken direct to the office appropriated to that class. When they are not posted separately a certain portion of them must necessarily be taken in the first instance to the wrong office, and then it is sometimes impossible to avoid a delay.

*MR. COHEN asked whether it was intended to extend the system of duplicate boxes to the whole of London.

MR. HANBURY replied that the Eastern Central District must first be dealt with on account of the enormous number of letters posted in that district, and owing to the fact that room could not be found to deal with them at St. Martin's-le-Grand.

PALACE OF WESTMINSTER—WORKS DEPARTMENT—EMPLOYEES' GRIEVANCES.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether he is aware that for the last thirty years the men of the Works Department have had an outing on the first Saturday of July, and that on the occasion they have been in the habit of coming to work on the morning of the day, and withdrawing at about 8.30 a.m., and have received pay for one half day, paying for the outing themselves; and will he explain why they have been this year deprived of this half-day's pay.

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. AKERS DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): The facts are as stated in the hon. Member's question. The practice referred to has applied, I understand, only to the works contractor's men employed about this building, and it is proposed to substitute some more satisfactory arrangement. Meantime the half-day's pay this year will be made good.

FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE REGULATIONS IN NORFOLK.

MR. SOAMES (Norfolk, S.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture if his attention has been drawn to the resolutions with reference to foot and mouth disease passed by the Norfolk County Council on the 7th instant; and whether, in the event of another out-

break, the Board of Agriculture will adopt the suggestions put forward in those resolutions.

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS (for Mr. LONG): I have received a copy of the resolutions to which the hon. Member refers. I shall be glad to give them my very careful consideration, but I could not properly enter into any undertaking as to the course which it would be my duty to adopt should any further outbreak of the disease unfortunately take place.

SANITATION IN THE ISLAND OF LEWIS.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether the Secretary for Scotland is aware that the medical officer of health for Ross and Cromarty in his report for last year states that, in a township in the Island of Lewis, there were forty-one cases of typhoid fever in a population of 300 within a period of six months, and points out that, although an isolation hospital is urgently necessary, the local authorities are powerless to provide one owing to the rates for the various parishes throughout the island being already so high; and, in view of the insanitary condition of many of the parishes in the island, will he consider the expediency of either urging the Treasury to provide the requisite funds for the erection of an isolation hospital, or introduce legislation at an early date such as will admit of the Congested Districts Board applying a portion of the funds at its disposal for the erection and maintenance of isolation hospitals where urgently needed in the congested area.

MR. WEIR: I beg also to ask the Lord Advocate, as representing the Secretary for Scotland, whether he is aware that the last report of the medical officer of health for Ross and Cromarty shows that if the Sanitary Clauses in the Public Health (Scotland) Act were strictly enforced in the Island of Lewis a large number of the inhabitants would be homeless; and will he state what steps he proposes to take in order to place the island on a satisfactory sanitary basis.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): In reply to Questions 23 and 24 as to the sanitary condition of the Island of Lewis, I must point out that the enforcement of the new provisions of the recent Public Health Act can be undertaken only gradually and with caution, both for the reason adduced by the hon. Member himself and because of the reluctance which he must know exists in the Highlands to removal and to isolated treatment of infectious cases. The Local Government Board are not inactive, and I know from official and other channels that progress is being made and that in some districts the present conditions compare very favourably with those observed not many years ago. I am informed by the Local Government Board that they are at the present moment in communication with more than one local authority in the island districts regarding new hospital accommodation, and plans are in hand for an hospital in the Carloway district. The Secretary for Scotland is not prepared at present to undertake legislation in connection with the matter.

SCOTTISH FISHERIES—AVOCH (ROSS-SHIRE) HARBOUR.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether the Fishery Board have now under consideration a proposal for improving the harbour accommodation at Avoch, Ross-shire; and can the Board now see their way to make a grant in aid of the work.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: An application for a grant towards improving Avoch harbour has been received by the Fishery Board, and has been remitted to a committee of their number for a report, on receipt of which the Board will be able to arrive at a decision.

DEPORTATION OF PAUPERS TO IRELAND.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: On behalf of the hon. Member for the St. Patrick Division of Dublin, I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Camberwell Board of Guardians intend sending Joseph Jones to Ireland against his will, although he has spent forty years in London; and whether, pending a change in the law, he can arrange that Joseph Jones can be retained in Camberwell.

THE SECRETARY TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. T. W. RUSSELL, Tyrone, S.): My right hon.

friend has asked me to reply to this question. I do not know how long the pauper referred to has resided in England, but I understand that he has previously been twice removed to Ireland, and that an order was obtained by the Camberwell Guardians on the 6th instant for his being again removed to that country. The pauper has, however, now given additional particulars as to his residence in Camberwell, and the guardians are causing further inquiries to be made. If the result is to show that he is settled in Camberwell, the order will not be proceeded with; but there is no power to require the guardians to abstain from removing the pauper to Ireland pending any alteration in the law on the subject, assuming that he is legally removable.

GREYSTONES (CO. WICKLOW) FORESHORE.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade is he aware that since the Board of Trade declined to prohibit the removal of gravel from the foreshore below high-water mark at Greystones, county Wicklow, English steamers are engaged in taking cargoes of it to Liverpool; whether the gravel is being sold; and, if so, by whom; whether the landlord of the foreshore above high-water mark has consented to the removal of the gravel; and whether the removal of the gravel will endanger the safety of the Wicklow Railway line; and whether he will make an inquiry into the matter.

MR. HANBURY (for Mr. RITCHIE): Gravel is to some extent removed from the foreshore below high-water mark at Greystones, but the Board of Trade do not know by whom, or where it is taken to. I understand that the owner of the beach above high-water mark allows gravel to be removed therefrom. The safety of the railway line is primarily a matter for the railway company, who have made no complaint on the subject, and at present the Board of Trade see no reason for an inquiry, as suggested by the hon. Member.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: Is it not the duty of the Board of Trade to see to this?

MR. HANBURY: No; the Board of Trade is not responsible, so I am informed.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Who has control, then, over the removal of the gravel?

MR. HANBURY: I can only give the answer which has been placed in my hands.

LISTOWEL-BALLYBUNION RAILWAY.

MR. FLAVIN: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he can give any information as to the approximate cost of the railway from Listowel, county Kerry, to Ballybunion, a seaside watering resort, which railway is built on the Lartigue single rail system.

MR. HANBURY (for Mr. RITCHIE): The railway company state as follows—

"The Ballybunion Railway cost thirty-three thousand pounds, including purchase of land, rolling stock, and everything connected with it."

This amount is shown in the annual Railway Returns laid before Parliament as the total authorised share and loan capital of the company, the whole of which has been paid up and raised.

MR. FLAVIN: Is this the only railway on the Lartigue system to be found in the United Kingdom?

MR. HANBURY: I cannot say.

GREEVEGUILLA (CO. KERRY) MAILS.

MR. FLAVIN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that dissatisfaction prevails in the western portion of Greeveguilla, situate near Killarney, county Kerry, owing to the fact that there is not a daily delivery of letters in that district; and whether, seeing that the Killarney Rural District Council passed a unanimous resolution in favour of a daily delivery of letters, and having regard to the representations made and the inconvenience caused, the Post Office authorities will take steps to remedy the grievance complained of.

MR. HANBURY: Applications have been received from persons residing in the townlands of Toornanonagh and Leamyglissane, which are in the neighbourhood of the Greeveguilla Post Office, for a delivery of correspondence on six days a week instead of four, as at present. In November last the delivery of letters

in the neighbourhood was increased in frequency from two to four days a week in some cases, and from three to four days a week in other cases, and fresh returns are now being taken of the correspondence for the places in question, with the view of ascertaining whether a delivery every week day is now warranted.

MR. FLAVIN: Do I understand the right hon. Gentleman to say it is under consideration whether the application shall be acceded to?

MR. HANBURY: Yes, that is so.

IRISH CATTLE SENT TO THE PORT OF LONDON.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he can state by what authority and for what reason cattle sent from Irish ports are prohibited from landing at the Port of London, although up till about thirty years ago such landing was permitted.

MR AKERS DOUGLAS (for Mr. LONG): There is no prohibition, so far as I am aware, against the landing of cattle from Ireland in the Port of London, but they could not, of course, be brought to the Deptford Foreign Animals Wharf, which is devoted exclusively to the reception of foreign animals.

MONAGHAN PETTY SESSIONAL APPEALS—CASES OF M'GUIGAN AND HUGHES.

MR. MACALEESE (Monaghan, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, with reference to the case of M'Guigan and Hughes, sentenced at the Monaghan Petty Sessions Court to long terms of imprisonment, and denied the right of appeal on a technicality raised by the Crown, whether he will advise the reconsideration of the sentences with a view to their mitigation.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. G. W. BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): It is not for me to act as suggested in the question. Any memorial from the prisoners, or on their behalf, praying for a mitigation of sentence, should be addressed to the Lord Lieutenant, in whom alone is vested the exercise of the prerogative of mercy.

BELFAST LAND COMMISSION—INCREASES OF RENT.

MR. SAMUEL YOUNG (Cavan, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the recent increases of rent made at Belfast by the Land Commissioners, and to the statement of Mr. Commissioner O'Brien as to the effect which these decisions are likely to have on rents in South Antrim and North Down; and whether, in view of the feeling produced amongst farmers in Ulster by the proceedings at the Commission, rules will be framed for the future guidance of the sub-commissioners.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: My attention was only called to this matter by a newspaper cutting which I received from the hon. Gentleman on arrival at the House this afternoon. With respect to the second paragraph, the framing of rules is entirely one for the consideration of the Land Commissioners themselves.

IRISH LOCAL GOVERNMENT—RATE ADJUSTMENTS.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, whether he is aware that in many electoral divisions in Ireland, under the adjustment order of the Irish Local Government Board, a rate which has accrued due in past years before the passing of the Local Government Act is about to be levied; whether the Irish Local Government Board have refused the application of several county councils in Ireland to permit the payment of this rate, which must now be borne exclusively by the occupiers, to be discharged by instalments, on the ground that such a course would be in contravention to law; and whether, having regard to the fact that the landlords are now exempted from contribution to this rate for the payment of half of which they would have been liable had it been levied when it accrued due, any steps will be taken to relieve the occupiers of a greater liability for the payment of this rate than that to which they were originally subject, having regard to the fact that the responsibility for the delay in the levy does not rest with them.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: This question presumably refers to an adjustment order, declaring in respect of each union the

balances due from electoral divisions to the union, and from the union to electoral divisions. The answer to the second paragraph is in the affirmative. As respects the last paragraph, no steps can be taken to relieve the occupiers of any portion of the rate for the adjustment of the balances due from electoral divisions to the union, nor on the other hand can any allowances be made to the landlord where a credit balance has been carried forward to a division by the order owing to the last rate made by the board of guardians on that division having been unnecessarily high. The debits and credits to be adjusted are, generally speaking, insignificant.

IRISH LOAN FUND BOARD.

MR. DILLON: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the sixty-second annual Report of the Loan Fund Board for Ireland, which states that the existing statutory powers of the Board are not sufficient to enable them to control effectively the operations of loan fund societies; and seeing that the House of Commons Committee of 1855 unanimously reported that legislation giving the Board greater powers of control was necessary, whether he can state why nothing has been done to carry out this recommendation of the Committee, and when the Government propose to introduce a Bill dealing with this subject.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: The answer to the first paragraph is in the affirmative. As respects the second paragraph I am unable to answer for my predecessors for the forty years following 1855. As the hon. Member is aware, a Bill has passed through all its stages in Parliament during the present session which meets the most pressing of the difficulties and hardships of the existing position; but the larger question of how to deal with the loan fund system generally is one respecting which I am not prepared at the present moment to make any statement.

MR. DILLON: But why has nothing been done?

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: We endeavoured to pass a Bill last year, but were prevented by the action of the hon. Member and his friends. We have passed one this year.

MR. DILLON: That Bill does not deal with the point raised in my question.

BELFAST RATES.

MR. MACALEESE: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland whether, having regard to Sub-section 9 of Section 54 of the Local Government Act of 1898, the public health charge of 7½d. in the £ in the city of Belfast is a rate for which immediate lessees are proportionately liable under any Act at present in force.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (MR. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): The rate of 7½d. in the £ referred to is not a public health charge within the meaning of Section 54, Sub-section 9 and Section 57 of the Act of 1898, because Belfast is an urban sanitary district. It is the portion of the borough rate levied for defraying the expenses incurred under the Public Health Acts in Belfast in pursuance of Section 226 of the Public Health (Ireland) Act, 1878, and the occupier has not by law any right of deduction in respect of the borough rate.

GLEBE LOANS ACTS.

MR. M'GHEE (Louth, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Treasury is making a profit out of the loans under the Glebe Loans Acts; whether he is aware that the Treasury admit that circumstances of hardship are suffered by glebe loan borrowers; and whether, in view of the fact that the Government are making a large reduction in the tithe-rent payable by Irish landlords, he can see his way to recommend the Treasury to make a substantial reduction in the annual instalments payable by glebe loan borrowers in Ireland.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: I understand the statement in the first paragraph is disputed by the Treasury. The second paragraph presumably refers to the passage in Sir David Harrel's letter of the 6th May, 1898, which expressly points out that, in the opinion of the Treasury, any hardships suffered by present incumbents are not of a kind calling for relaxation of the terms of the loans to borrowers. The whole matter has been fully placed by the Irish Government before the Treasury, and any further

questions on the subject should be addressed to that Department.

INSPECTOR GENERAL ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY.

MR. FLAVIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether it is proposed to fill the position of Inspector General of Royal Irish Constabulary by the promotion of an officer serving in the force, or whether it is the intention of the Government to fill the position by the appointment of an officer not belonging to the force; and, if so, what are his qualifications for the position.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: The position of Inspector General of the Royal Irish Constabulary has been offered to and accepted by Colonel Neville Chamberlain, at present in South Africa. In the opinion of the Irish Government he possesses the qualifications of experience and capacity which fit him for the position.

MR. DILLON: Does the right hon. Gentleman say that this gentleman has any experience whatever of police duties?

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: Not directly of police duties, but he has had plenty of experience—in South Africa, for instance.

Mr. FLAVIN: Has he ever served an hour in the Irish constabulary? Is it because he served in South Africa that he is going to be appointed over the heads of other officers?

[No answer was given.]

CASE OF EDMUND CARMODY.

MR. FLAVIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Edmund Carmody, of Cuss, county Kerry, who was convicted at the Cork winter assizes in December, 1898, and sentenced to three years penal servitude, was mainly the support of his father and mother; and whether, seeing that the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland has received a petition, largely signed by magistrates, clergymen, and the general public, praying for the release of the prisoner, who has now served more than half his sentence, he will recommend the consideration of his case.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: I have no information as to the first paragraph. The case of this prisoner has been twice before the Lords Justices on a memorial for a mitigation of sentence—the last occasion so recently as April of this year; but it was decided that the law should take its course. It is not my province to take the action suggested at the conclusion of the question.

MR. FLAVIN: May I again ask why the same clemency has not been extended to this man as was given to Lord Kenmare's bailiff?

[No answer was given.]

IRISH COUNTY COURT ADMINISTRATION.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: On behalf of the hon. Member for the St. Patrick Division of Dublin I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland whether he intends to introduce a Bill to amend the grievances complained of by traders in connection with the administration of the County Court Acts (Ireland).

MR. ATKINSON: I beg to call the hon. Member's attention to the County Courts (Ireland) Bill, introduced by the Lord Chancellor for Ireland, in another place, and which is down for the Committee stage to-day.

SUNDAY OPENING OF PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS.

MR. MASSEY-MAINWARING: I beg to ask the first Lord of the Treasury why catalogues cannot be purchased in the National Gallery and other public galleries in London, although catalogues are procurable on Sundays at the Wallace Collection at Hertford House and at the National Portrait Gallery.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am informed, with regard to the National Gallery, that the demand for catalogues was so small when the gallery was first opened on Sundays that the sale was discontinued when the police took charge of the Sunday opening. At South Kensington I learn there was practically no sale, as every object is described on labels. As to the other places named in the question catalogues are on sale.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can now make a statement of the intentions of the Government as to the legislative business of the remaining weeks of the session.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I rise to make, in obedience to the promise which I gave to the right hon. Gentleman a week ago, my statement as to the future business of the session, and I think it will be convenient if I divide the Bills now on the Paper into a series of classes, and take each class by itself. The first class consists of those measures introduced since the Government asked for special privileges as regards time. With regard to those measures, I promised the House that if they proved controversial they should not be pressed; and of course that promise will be rigidly adhered to. The Government Bills introduced since the period I have named I believe are three small Departmental ones—the Bill of my right hon. friend the Home Secretary, the Isle of Man Bill, which, I believe, is wholly uncontroversial; a small Bill introduced a few days ago by the Chancellor of the Exchequer dealing with oil in tobacco—a Bill of which I confess myself quite ignorant, but which I understand meets with the general approval of those interested in the matter; and the third Bill is that introduced by my right hon. friend the First Lord of the Admiralty, the Naval Reserves Bill, the object of which is to make it possible to embody sailors and marines after their first period of twelve years service in the Reserve. I earnestly hope that the House will think fit to pass that Bill, which, I am convinced, will add materially to our naval defences and the strength of this country.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: It has not yet been introduced.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No. It is a very short Bill of one clause. If opposed it cannot be passed, but I hope it will not be opposed. There are some other Bills which I hope to pass with regard to which no pledge has been given and which cannot pass if they are opposed. They are the Larceny Bill, two Local Government Board Bills for Ireland, a Poor Relief Bill for Ireland, and the Diocesan Records Bill. I have no ground for thinking that these Bills will meet with opposition in any part of the House, but if they do they will not be pressed by the Government. The third class contains the two annual Bills which the House has to deal with every session—namely, the Public Works Loans Bill and the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill. These are Bills which the House will have to put on the Statute-book. Then I come to the fourth class, which includes small Departmental Bills, which I think can easily be dealt with in the interstices of more important or at all events of more far-reaching measures, and which will not, I think, actually prolong the session—the County Courts Investment Bill, the Inebriates Amendment Bill, the Post Office (Sites) Bill, the Elementary Education (England) Bill, and two Irish Education Bills, which I believe are desired by hon. Members opposite. That is the list of Departmental Bills. Then there are four Military Bills on the Paper which have come down to us from another place. Of these one is, I am sorry to say, destroyed by the fact that it does not technically comply with the Standing Orders of the House—that is, the Manœuvres Bill. I need say no more about that. There remain the Volunteer Bill, the Reserve Forces Bill, and the Military Lands Bill. The Volunteers Bill is a short Bill. It is designed to carry out two objects unanimously recommended by the Committee which sat in 1894, and which it is exceedingly desirable should be carried out. The Reserve Forces Bill is to do away with a defect which the recent mobilisation of forces in this country has brought to light. It appeared that in order to carry out the present law it was necessary to mobilise no less than 8,000 men, and as soon as they were mobilised they had to be given leave of absence. It would be, I think, very important that we should put that measure on the Statute-book. The Military Lands Bill is one which I think—from all the conversation which reaches me and from discussion in the public press in regard to the necessity of increased accommodation for ranges and for the purposes of training in shooting—is really most important and ought to become law. It makes workable two Acts which this House has already passed, but which, for reasons it would not be proper for me to enter into now, are rendered absolutely ineffective by technical defects.

I refer to the Acts of 1892 and 1897. I believe that when my hon. friend the Under Secretary for War has an opportunity of explaining this Bill to the House it will probably be felt that it is a Bill which we ought to pass without any further delay. There is one clause in it which has led to a great deal of controversy, and as to which considerable difference of opinion prevails. It is the clause providing for the use of the machinery of the Allotments Act for the compulsory leasing of lands to be used for military purposes. There are obvious objections and difficulties both to the object of the clause and the method by which it seeks to obtain the object in view, and the Government do not propose to press that clause on the House. With that reservation, I hope that the Bill will not excite hostility in any quarter of the House. Then there are two Bills still before the Grand Committees—the Companies Bill and the Money-lending Bill. It would not be proper for me to make a final statement now as to Bills which are not absolutely before the House at this moment, but I have every hope that both Bills may become law before the end of the present session. As regards the Companies Bill, the details have no doubt excited a great deal of commentary and animadversion upstairs, but as regards the general principle we are generally agreed; and I hope that the modifications which have been introduced upstairs or promised for the Report stage are such as will mitigate or altogether remove the objections which may have been felt to the details. As to the Money-lending Bill, I remember that, when I was making a parallel statement to this last session, the Leader of the Opposition then expressed his regret that we had found it necessary to abandon the further consideration of that Bill. I think he singled it out from among other measures as one over which he dropped a pious tear; and therefore I trust he will assist us in our attempt to pass the Bill now.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I may have another tear to drop.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I need not mention the Irish Tithes Bill and the Agricultural Holdings Bill, because they have reached the Third Reading stage, and the House will naturally expect them to pass with no undue delay. We propose to drop the Factories and Workshops Bill, the Lunacy Bill, the Youthful Offenders Bill, the Savings Banks Bill, the Dogs Bill, the Sea Fisheries Bill, the Palatine Court of Durham Bill, and the Reformatories and Industrial Schools Bill. We cannot hope, either, to proceed further in the present session with the very important English educational measure which has recently been introduced in the Lords by the President of the Council. There is also a Scotch Education Bill about which I fear I must say the same thing. This Bill is one which we were particularly anxious to pass, but I have taken some trouble to inquire what views are held with regard to it; and though I believe that in Scotland generally it meets with a very large measure of support, yet it does raise more than one point of controversy, and is not popular in one or two districts in Scotland. In those circumstances, a Bill of that magnitude and importance can hardly hope to pass at the end of the session, but I earnestly hope that no long delay will occur before it is reintroduced and passed into law. I have now gone over the whole list of Bills now on the Paper, and it only remains for me to speak with regard to Supply, as to which also the right hon. Gentleman has, I believe, a question on the Paper. If the House grants, as I do not doubt that it will, the three additional days which I am about to ask for, we shall have four days remaining for Committee of Supply, as well as one day for Report. But in addition to the Supply which has been asked for in the ordinary Estimates of the year and in addition to any Supplementary Estimates of the ordinary kind, it will be necessary for my hon. friend the Under Secretary for War to introduce a very important Estimate—important both as to its amount and as to the subject with which it deals. Among other services that Estimate will provide for what, I hope, are the final payments for the South African War and the cost of the military operations in China, as well as some other very important items of Army expenditure. That is a Supplementary Estimate, but it appears to me that when an Estimate of that magnitude and dealing with topics of that importance is introduced at this stage of the session it is only fair to the House that it should not be one of the counted days.

in Supply, and therefore I shall endeavour to make such arrangements as will allow the House to have one day's discussion on it, without trenching on the twenty-three days allocated under the Standing Order. My right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer will also have to ask the House before we separate to make further financial provision to meet the additional expenditure which is required in the main, but not wholly, by the Supplementary Estimate to which I have referred. I hope I have been clear, and that my statement will commend itself to the approval of the House.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I would venture to suggest that the most convenient course for discussing the statement of the right hon. Gentleman will be on the motion to be subsequently moved. It is always unsatisfactory to attempt to do so by means of question and answer. I have no doubt that hon. Members on both sides will find that the more convenient plan for giving expression to their views.

MR. COURTNEY (Cornwall, Bodmin): Can the right hon. Gentleman give us some information which might facilitate the discussion? Will he say how he proposes to allocate the four remaining days of Supply?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: My right hon. friend knows the principle on which the Government have invariably proceeded—that is, to consult the wishes and convenience of the House. I do not think it would be desirable for me to state at this moment how we shall allocate the days, because the course of events outside and other considerations make it inconvenient to settle the matter too long beforehand.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): Have the Government power to give an additional day for the Supplementary Estimate?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes, it is possible, if I put some other business down first.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER (Belfast, W.): Will a day be appropriated to the War Office Vote?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No, Sir. I should be reluctant to promise that, not only on the general ground, but because I am not sure that one of the remaining days ought to be given to the War Office Vote. There must be further discussion of War Office affairs on the Supplementary Estimate, and the War Office has already had much discussion. The Vote has been held over in obedience to the very proper suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition in order that if unforeseen events occur there may be an opportunity of discussion.

MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.): Of the remaining days, will not two be given, as usual, to the Colonial Office and the Foreign Office Votes?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: That is the ordinary form of allocation, but I do not wish to be induced to go further than I have already done.

MR. MACLEAN: Can the right hon. Gentleman now fix the date for the discussion of the Indian Budget?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It will certainly be next week. I trust that that will be satisfactory.

MR. FLAVIN: Can the right hon. Gentleman say in round figures what is the amount of the Supplementary Vote for South Africa?

[The question was not answered.]

QUEEN ANNE'S BOUNTY BOARD (JOINT COMMITTEE).

Report, with Minutes of Evidence, from the Joint Committee, brought up, and read; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 277.]

FIRE BRIGADES.

Report from the Select Committee, brought up, and read; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 278.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Committee to be printed. [No. 278.]

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension Bill, with an Amendment.

That they have agreed to—Railways (Prevention of Accidents) Bill, with Amendments.

RAILWAYS (PREVENTION OF ACCIDENTS) BILL.

Lords Amendments to be considered upon Thursday, and to be printed. [Bill 299.]

THE IRISH LANGUAGE IN IRISH SCHOOLS.

[PROPOSED MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.]

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): I beg to ask leave to move the adjournment of the House in order to call attention to a definite matter of urgent public importance—namely, the refusal by the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland to consider favourably the memorial presented to them by the managers of 1,200 National schools in Ireland praying that in Irish-speaking districts a bilingual system of education should be adopted, and that in other districts Irish should be taught as a remunerated subject in school hours.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member has been good enough to hand me a copy of his motion, and I think that this is a question which I ought not to submit to the House under Standing Order No. 17 as one definite and of urgent importance. The alleged grievance is in itself rather a general and a continuing one than of sudden urgency. What, however, principally influences me is the fact that the First Lord of the Treasury has stated to the House that the Irish Education Estimates will be taken on Friday; and it is not only in accordance with the proper construction of the Standing Order, but in accordance with precedents, that where there is an almost immediate opportunity for discussing a matter of this kind that opportunity should not be anticipated. I feel bound, therefore, to say that I ought not to submit this motion to the House.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that you will not think I desire to dispute your ruling in any way if I ask for permission to point out that only one remaining day is left for Irish Estimates. A new scheme of primary education covering a multitude of points must be discussed on that day, and it is impossible to hope that during one sitting of the House the whole of that scheme could be discussed, and, in addition, this grievance about the Irish language. Therefore, it is perfectly impossible that the Irish education scheme can be fully discussed. Upon a point of order, I respectfully submit that the possibility of a discussion taking place on some future date does not exclude this matter from the interpretation of the Standing Order, and I wish to call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the interpretation which you have yourself given on this very point. On the 6th of April last you said †—

"The Standing Order presents some difficulty in interpretation. When I came to the Chair I found the practice of the Speaker had been to deal with the question of definiteness himself."

I wish to point out that this is not a general grievance, but a definite act—namely, the refusal of the Commissioners to accede to a particular memorial upon a particular point. You went on, upon the occasion I alluded to, to further state—

"But as regards the urgency and public importance of the subject they have practically always been left to the decision of the House by the rising of at least forty Members in their places. I say 'practically,' for certainly I do not understand that the Speaker is bound to put a question as one of urgency and of public importance if it is obviously ridiculous or frivolous, or so obviously unimportant that the Speaker ought not to put it."

I submit that unless you, Mr. Speaker, take the view that this subject is "ridiculous or frivolous" it is in order under your ruling, which I have just quoted.

*MR. SPEAKER: On the occasion to which the hon. Member refers I was suddenly asked a general question, and I do not pretend that the words I used contained a considered or exhaustive definition of all the grounds upon which the question of leave to move should not be put from the Chair. The words "ridiculous and frivolous" were, probably, too strong. On the present occasion I have considered the matter carefully, and I must adhere to my ruling not to submit the motion for the adjournment to the House.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: It is impossible for me to contest the matter further, although I am led to hope that an opportunity will be forthcoming. I beg to give notice that on the Second Reading of the Primary Education Bill I shall move—

"That this House declines to give any additional powers to the Commissioners until they have amended their code of rules and regulations so as to provide for the teaching of Irish in the schools under their control."

† See *The Parliamentary Debates* [Fourth Series], Vol. lxxxi., p. 1427

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (SUPPLY).

Ordered, That three additional days be allowed to the Business of Supply.—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (GOVERNMENT BUSINESS).

Motion made and Question proposed, "That, for the remainder of the session, Government Business be not interrupted under the provisions of any Standing Order regulating the Sittings of the House; and may be entered upon at any hour, though opposed, and that at the conclusion of Government Business each day Mr. Speaker do adjourn the House without Question put." — (*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I do not think that we have any reason to complain of the statement made by the right hon. Gentleman, but there is one point on which I think the House expected to hear a little more. It is the point which governs to a large extent the whole of his statement—and that is, when does the right hon. Gentleman expect that the House will be relieved from its duties? It is clear that if the House is going to sit well on into August it will be able to transact a larger amount of business than it can undertake if it is interrupted at an earlier period, and, therefore, though the right hon. Gentleman's statement is satisfactory so far as it goes, he has not told us what his views are on that question. Those views affect not only the Bills, but also the important question of Supply. There are certain Votes which must be taken, and on which it is only right that the House should have a full opportunity of discussion. I would name, for example, in such a year as this, the Colonial Office Vote. It embraces not only the whole of the South African question, but the question of Ashanti and other questions. Then there is the Foreign Office Vote, upon which the whole situation in China has to be considered. These two Votes appear to me to require a day for the discussion of each of them. Then the right hon. Gentleman passed somewhat lightly over the War Office Vote. There was force in the inquiry of the hon. Member for West Belfast, when he asked whether a day would be granted for a discussion of it. Although it is true that the War Office Vote can be suspended, as it were, and put off until an advanced period of the session in order that we may have an opportunity of considering the military questions generally, yet there are this year in the minds of hon. Members many topics connected with that Vote and the conduct and disposition of business by the Secretary of State himself, which will surely require a considerable time for the discussion which may be needed on that important subject. There are fifteen Bills which are more or less non-contentious, but a non-contentious Bill, I need haardly say, is not a definition which always maintains itself. Even in the course of half an hour since the right hon. Gentleman made his statement, one of those Bills apparently has transferred itself to the category of being a contentious measure, because notice of an Amendment has now been given to it, which transfers it from one list to the other. On the whole, however, I see no reason to dispute in the main the classification of the right hon. Gentleman. But then we come to one or two Bills which come from the House of Lords, mostly military Bills. With regard to these, I say at once that I think the House may very well be called upon to consider and to pass the Reserve Forces Bill and the Military Lands Bill, which, as the right hon. Gentleman says, carry out the intentions which are already expressed in the regulations in regard to the organisation of the Army. It can hardly be denied that the Volunteers Bill involves or may involve a serious alteration in the character of the Volunteer force. It accepts as a permanent condition of service for Volunteers a kind of service which has never been contemplated hitherto. But I would appeal to the Government on broader grounds. I think it is most undesirable at the end of the session to make a material difference in the constitution of the Volunteer force, or indeed I may say in any other branch of our military forces. We are all impressed with the necessity of doing everything we can to strengthen the defences of the Empire and to increase military efficiency, but that is not a thing to be done in a hurry. Many of those who are best qualified to advise the Government on such a matter are at present engaged in South Africa, and surely it would be better to defer the matter. What is to be gained by forcing the Bill through the

House under pressure? The Bill ought to be reserved for fuller and wider consideration on the part of those who are responsible for advising Parliament on the subject. On all these grounds I hope the right hon. Gentleman will not persist in the Volunteers Bill. If he does, I am afraid that there will be a considerable amount of time spent on it, and that it will evoke a considerable amount of opposition also, although it is not so much on the ground of that opposition as on the broader grounds I have mentioned that I would appeal to him. Then the right hon. Gentleman recalled the fact that I had last year personally expressed some regret that the Money-lending Bill was lost, but I would point out that an expression of regret at the way the Government have arranged their business is quite consistent with a perfectly good disposition towards the Bill itself, and when I expressed some doubt a few days ago, it was on the ground that the Bill had become so pushed towards the end of the session that it was almost hopeless to get it through its stages now. There are one or two other Bills not mentioned by the right hon. Gentleman and which, I suppose, from the fact that the right hon. Gentleman has taken no notice of them, are also to be regarded as lost.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am not speaking of Government Bills. Is there no hope for other than Government Bills? Is not this a strange arrangement, that we have had Bills examined with the greatest care by Standing Committees, considered, amended, and thrown into better shape, and then dropped without a word of regret, and without any possibility of making use of the pains, and labour, and time lavished upon them? There are two Bills not affecting this House which I have in my mind, and surely it is most desirable that some corner should be found for them. They are both Bills which would be extremely well received in the colonies, and now we are all speaking of a closer connection with the colonies and our desire to show a better feeling towards them. One is the Copyright Bill, which has passed the House of Lords, and which I believe has a clause embodying an arrangement which Canada has been struggling for for years and years, and which has now been licked into such a shape as to give perfect satisfaction to the Canadian people. I hope there may be means found of passing that Bill. Then there is the Colonial Marriages Bill, which has had a chequered career. It has now gone triumphantly through the House of Lords, and I believe it is unanimously desired by the colonies. Yet the Government, who are prating every day about their desire to consider the views of our colonial fellow-subjects in every way, now propose calmly to give the cold shoulder to this important Bill and proceed with those comparatively unimportant measures of which the right hon. Gentleman has given a list. I hope the right hon. Gentleman may be able to modify in some measure what he has promised; but I think what above all others would facilitate Government business and would be likely to put the House in a sympathetic mood, would be if the right hon. Gentleman could state now when, according to his estimate, the remaining business can be finally disposed of.

MR. LEIGHTON (Shropshire, Oswestry): I hope my right hon. friend will adhere to his statement regarding the Bills by which he intends to lighten the ship; but he referred to a certain Bill which he said would not be proceeded with if it were opposed. I mean the Diocesan Records Bill, which is opposed by at least two hon. Members on this side of the House. There are two notices of motion against, and so far as it has been discussed it has been by no means favourably received. I was very much surprised to hear my right hon. friend say that he proposed to push it through. I feel sure it will be opposed very seriously, and I hope my right hon. friend will not force it through the House of Commons at one o'clock or two o'clock in the morning.

MR. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.): I have heard with great regret that it is proposed once more to abandon the Lunacy Bill, because it is urgently required, alike for the insane as well as for the protection of the public. We have been told on no less an authority than that of the Lord Chancellor that grave abuses have taken place. This Bill would provide safeguards against those abuses, and it also contains provisions which are

absolutely necessary for the proper execution of the principal Act. The Bill was originally introduced into Parliament in 1897. From that time it has been regularly introduced at the beginning of every session, and having passed through all its stages in another place, has been regularly abandoned in this House at the end of every session. I think that is very much to be regretted. The Government have treated this question, which is one of great social importance, with contemptuous indifference, and I think it is a public scandal that a Bill of this kind should be abandoned year after year, especially when we know that lunacy is unhappily increasing by leaps and bounds. There is an additional and very strong reason why this Bill should be proceeded with during the present session. We have been startled recently by revelations as to a practice which has been proved to exist in two metropolitan unions, and which I believe to be widely prevalent, under which poor law officers——

*Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member appears to me to be discussing the Bill.

Mr. PICKERSGILL: I will, of course, submit to your ruling, Sir; but I think that I can show that my observations are strictly in order, and for this reason: The other day the Lord Chancellor gave a pledge that a clause to deal with this particular matter should be introduced into this Bill, and therefore, if this Bill is abandoned,† the special mode of dealing with the public scandal to which I have referred, which was indicated by the Lord Chancellor, will fall through. I think, under the circumstances, we are justified in asking the right hon. Gentleman, if this Bill is to be abandoned, what steps he proposes to take to give effect to the pledge of the Lord Chancellor? I hope this important matter will receive the attention which I think I may fairly claim for it, and that the right hon. Gentleman will be able to reconsider the decision he has just given.

Mr. DILLON: This motion was never made with less justification than on the present occasion. It is a recognised custom, when the Government asks the House of Commons to make what is really a very great sacrifice, for the House to examine into the use which the Government have made of their facilities during the session. During the many years I have been in close attendance in this House no Government have made such a bad use of the time at their disposal, and have been less entitled to ask the House to make this sacrifice than the present Government. We have had many organised counts-out by the Government during the session. We had to adjourn for a garden party—a thing unheard of in the history of this House. In fact throughout the session there has been displayed——

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Gentleman is entirely mistaken. The debate on the particular Bill he refers to was adjourned, but Government business was proceeded with.

Mr. DILLON: Important Government business on that occasion was interrupted for the purpose of the garden party. The Government then put forward a non-contentious Bill, and afterwards organised a count-out, which was successful. I believe it would have been more honest had the Government made the motion for the adjournment of the House. I allude to this matter as an illustration of the way the Government have used the time of the House at their disposal during the session. An impression has been created on my mind and on that of others on this side of the House, that the Government were in the same chronic position as the Irish judges who tried to persuade the public that they had something to do—a task of enormous difficulty. The Government have had little or nothing to do, and what they had to do they did not do. Instead of devoting time to discussing the misdeeds of the great public Departments, to the scandals at and mismanagement of the War Office, and matters of real public interest—such matters as are concerned with the proceedings of the Executive Government itself—they have frittered away the time of the House in very uninteresting business. And now, at this period of the session, they come down, as if they had been a hardworking and industrious Government, and put us in the position of being at their mercy to keep us every night to three or four in the morning. In my opinion they have

† See *The Parliamentary Debates* [Fourth Series], Vol. lxxxiv., page 1064.

established no claim, by their conduct during the session, to that indulgence at the hands of the House. The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House told us that it was the intention of the Government to pass the Companies Bill and the Money-lending Bill, besides a number of other small Bills, including some Irish Bills, which he said were non-contentious. Some of these non-contentious Bills, I am afraid, he will find out are contentious when we come to deal with them; and I presume they will be dropped. But I do not believe that there is any prospect of passing the two important Bills the right hon. Gentleman mentioned—the Companies Bill and the Money-lending Bill. Having the misfortune of being on the Standing Committee on Law, I protest against the Government doing now what they have done before—introducing Bills at this stage of the session they have no real intention of passing, and at the same time retaining Members locked up in the Committee rooms upstairs, where the atmosphere is atrocious, when there is no reasonable prospect of the Bills on which so much labour is expended being passed into law. I repeat it is most unreasonable to ask us to sit after twelve o'clock on the pretence that the Companies Bill and the Money-lending Bill are to be passed into law, when at a later stage the Government know they will be thrown overboard. But there is another ground on which I am entitled to oppose this motion, and that is the abuse of the time at the disposal of the Government in connection with Irish questions. Irish business, this year and last year, was chiefly concerned—as it generally is, except when some great Irish measure is brought forward—with the administration of the Executive in Ireland, and I protest against the custom of the Government in limiting and narrowing the opportunities for discussion of the conduct of the Executive Government in Ireland. What has been done this year? The Government have deliberately offered us only two nights for the discussion of the Executive Government in Ireland, while they have occupied nearly five nights of Government time in endeavouring to drive through the House one of the most iniquitous and scandalous Bills ever submitted to the House of Commons. I ask, is that a just or a reasonable way to deal with Ireland? We are told now that of the time which still remains to us we are to have only one further night to discuss Irish Supply, making three in all—a number utterly inadequate and insufficient. The result will be that this, as last year, more than half of the most important of the Irish Votes—not to speak of the minor details of Irish expenditure—will be closured or passed without any discussion. I think that is one of the greatest invasions on the true province and rights of the House ever attempted in the history of Parliament. For these reasons I am, for my part, entirely opposed to the motion before the House. I think this indulgence ought not to be given to the Government as a matter of course. It only ought to be granted when the House is convinced on examination that the Government have fairly and properly conducted the business of the session and put the time placed at their disposal to a fair and proper use. Finally, I think that the Government on the present occasion, when they are asking for greater facilities for sitting so late, ought to have told us at all events the proximate date at which they intend to bring the session to a close.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES said that the most important matter announced by the Front Bench was that of the new Estimates. He called them new Estimates because they were practically new and raised new matters of policy. He would call attention to the provision of an order in the Business Paper which stated that any additional Estimates for any new service or matter not included in the original Estimates of the year should be submitted for the consideration of the Committee of Supply on any date not later than two days before the Committee closed. He was very anxious that that order should be observed, for there could be no question that in fact these were new Estimates, and would raise very serious questions which might even become more serious before the Committee discussed them. He congratulated Her Majesty's Government on having abandoned several Bills to which he himself had given his most determined opposition, including the Dogs Bill, the Savings Bank Amendment Bill, and the Undersized Fish Bill, his opposition to which had become historical. That Bill, which was the invention of the opposite side, had been introduced in different forms on six different occasions, and

had been too lightly adopted by the present Government. He congratulated the Government on having, for the sixth time, abandoned an attempt to prevent the people from getting cheap food, and he hoped the attempt would never be renewed. He thought the motion of the Leader of the House was a very reasonable one. The First Lord of the Treasury had mentioned thirty Bills which might conceivably be passed, and which the right hon. Gentleman hoped might be passed before the end of the session; but he had sacrificed half a dozen of them, and more certainly would have to go. He believed that both the Companies Bill and the Money-lending Bill would also have to go. In the meantime the right hon. Gentleman had sacrificed three Bills in which he was particularly interested, and he expressed his gratitude to and admiration of the right hon. Gentleman for his sound discretion.

MR. LAWSON WALTON (Leeds, S.) said that one of the measures which the First Lord of the Treasury proposed to proceed with was the Companies Bill. He would ask why a measure of such great gravity was not introduced at an earlier period of the session. The Bill was still being discussed upstairs, and it was most unreasonable to ask the House, when the measure came down there, to consider Amendments which involved very important variations of the permanent law of the country in regard to one of the most important branches of jurisprudence, in the small hours of the morning. If this measure was to receive adequate discussion it should be debated at an early period of the evening.

*MR. CHANNING protested against the motion. The fact that it had to be moved was a condemnation of the conduct of business by Her Majesty's Government. The right hon. Gentleman had to put to his credit a very important reform in the conduct of the business of the House—namely, the allocation of certain days for the discussion of Supply. He desired to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether in the present state of business the fact that he asked the House to sit up to any hour of the morning to discuss Bills of great importance was an indication that he and those who worked with him had not given sufficient consideration to the essential point that these Bills ought to have been introduced and discussed in the earlier part of the session. In recent years the earlier days of the session had been wasted in desultory discussions on Supply, which it would have been advantageous to have brought to an earlier conclusion. He hoped that the hon. Member for East Mayo would divide the House against the motion. He thought that instead of the House being asked at this time of the year to sit up to all hours to attempt to clear up important points and deal with important measures, as had been the case of late years, they ought to be taken earlier in the session. The right hon. Gentleman would remember that during the present session he had given members—and no doubt he had gained popularity in consequence—a much longer recess both at Easter and Whitsuntide. That was an altogether wrong principle, and it would have been much better if the House met earlier and forced important business through at an earlier date, and this portion of the session given over to lighter and more uncontroversial work. He wished to support the hon. Member for South Leeds with regard to the Companies Bill. It would be a very grave error of policy if that Bill were not proceeded with and passed into law during the present session. Both he and other Members of the House would be quite willing to form part of a quorum in order to help to carry such Bills forward, and they would deeply regret it if the Companies Bill was not passed. As an illustration of the way in which very important measures were rushed through, he drew attention to the fact that the discussion on the Third Reading of the Housing of the Working Classes Bill was curtailed and shortened in a manner which was very prejudicial to the interest of the great towns of this country. It was quite time that the way of ordering the business of the House, and the almost indecent manner in which it was conducted, was altered. All the labours of the Grand Committees with regard to the Companies Bill, and other important Bills, might now have to be thrown aside, and all the arrangements of the Government showed lack of consideration. It would be discreditable to the House if they did not clear up a creditable amount of work before they separated. He expressed a hope that in the future the work of the

session would be so rearranged as to enable the House to discuss the most important business in the earlier part of the session. With regard to Supply, he noticed the provision to take an extra day in order to consider the questions raised by the Supplementary Estimate. That was a reasonable concession to the interest of the public and the House; but he hoped they would have some assurance that the two most important Votes which had to be considered before the session closed—the Colonial Vote, which involved the conduct of affairs in Cape Colony and South Africa, which was of vital importance, and the Foreign Office Vote, for which two full days ought to be assigned—would be brought on at the earliest possible moment; and that the earliest possible day would be given to the Colonial Vote. It would be most unsatisfactory to the country and to the House if that course was not pursued.

LORD BALCARRES (Chorley, Lancashire): I am in charge of a Bill which has gone through this House, and also the House of Lords, which has made a few trifling amendments in it, and it now awaits the consideration of this House. The amendments are of a purely formal character, but as the motion now stands the chances of the Bill passing are nil. I wish to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he could meet such a case as this, and other measures which are uncontentious, by allowing us to try and get them through after the Government business is concluded. By this motion the Government appropriate the whole of our time, and I wish to ask, on the conclusion of public business, that we private Members should be allowed to push forward our Bills. I suggest that we should be allowed fifteen minutes each day, otherwise, by the operation of the two words "I object," we shall lose some very useful measures.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs): I cannot help thinking that the Government are dealing rather harshly with the Bills of private Members. I refer particularly to the Temperance Bills, one of which has passed first and second reading, and through Committee as well, and will now be sacrificed. All these Bills are based on recommendations of Royal Commissions appointed by the Government and two of which were appointed by the present Government. Those Commissions, after sitting several years and after grave consideration, came to unanimous conclusions upon certain topics. The Government not being prepared to legislate upon them, private Members have brought in Bills dealing with one or two of the minor points, and the Government give them no facilities whatever. I hope temperance people will take into consideration that the Government now want to take all the remaining time, and they cannot find time for temperance legislation for the reason that there are six Military Bills, and the whole time of the House has been used for the discussion of military measures. Not a single hour can they find for temperance legislation, which would be carried through without a division. Then, with regard to the Companies Bill, I cannot understand why this Bill has not passed into law. I cannot conceive a greater insult to the House of Commons. A Grand Committee has been sitting for days, considering this Bill very carefully, and I do not believe that there has been any waste of time. The President of the Board of Trade does not suggest that the discussion has been unduly prolonged. The Government then go through the farce—for it is a farce unless it is proposed that we should carry it through—to suspend the Standing Orders to extend the time so that we may have an opportunity to carry it through. Is it to be expected that the Grand Committee should consider this very important Bill, sitting for an extra hour each day, when they know perfectly well that it is not proposed to give a Third Reading to the Bill? If that is so, it inflicts considerable humiliation upon the Grand Committee. The right hon. Gentleman ought not to have asked them to consider it unless he proposed to pass it. Here is the most important Bill of the session, when one takes into account the interests with which it deals, and the changes it proposes to make in the existing law; and when one considers the complicated character of its provisions, it is a Bill that should be considered very carefully. As the right hon. Gentleman has said, it is a Bill as to the principle of which there is no difference of opinion, but that is exactly the kind of Bill that requires the most consideration. When a Bill is introduced, and there is a contention as to the principle, Amendments

are very often moved for the purpose of weakening it; but where the principle is agreed, Members join together in moving Amendments to strengthen the Bill, and this is the Bill which the Government cannot find time before twelve o'clock to consider. For this the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury is responsible. He has managed matters in such a way that the most important Bill is introduced at the end of the session. It is then taken upstairs, where it cannot be disposed of until the end of this week, and it cannot be before this House until next week, when other Bills will prevent its being taken until after twelve. I support the appeal of my hon. and learned friend, that the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury shall give us a pledge not only that the Bill shall be carried through, but that it shall be considered at a time when Members are able to apply their energies to it without distraction.

MR. GALLOWAY (Manchester, S.W.), who was several times called upon to speak up, was understood to say that he would like to ask a question with regard to the Government proposals as to the widows and children of those who fell in the war. The right hon. Gentleman had said in answer to a question that it was the intention of the Government to deal with that matter. What he now wished to know was whether, before the House separated, the Government would announce to the country the proposals they had in view, and whether the right hon. Gentleman would undertake that the Patriotic Commissioners would not be allowed to pursue their old tactics of accumulating the funds, which they had already begun to do. If the right hon. Gentleman could give an assurance on that point it would be of considerable importance to the country. He also desired to join in the appeal to the right hon. Gentleman not to take the Companies Bill after twelve o'clock, for a reason which had not been put to the House. The Bill had come down from the House of Lords, and a great many points had been deferred for consideration, and if those important points were going to be raised at two or three o'clock in the morning a great deal of harm might he done to a very useful measure. He therefore appealed to the right hon. Gentleman not to ask the House to discuss these matters in the early hours of the morning.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): I am much afraid if the right hon. Gentleman takes the advice of the hon. Gentleman behind him he will not pass the Companies Bill this session. It is a very important Bill, but we know that some hon. Gentlemen are not very desirous that the Bill should become law; but if it is to be passed I hope the right hon. Gentleman will not listen to the appeal that has just been made. There is another Bill which has been sent down from the House of Lords, the Bill for the prevention of corruption, a most admirable Bill, which may be said to be a Governmental if not a Government Bill. It was brought in by the Lord Chief Justice. Now we know perfectly well that in the House of Lords there are a great many judicial Gentlemen of the very highest ability and reputation, and when a Bill has found favour with them we may regard its being sent here as an appeal by the Lord Chief Justice and the judicial bench of the House of Lords to the House of Commons to carry it through. This is a Bill which makes certain things frauds which are not frauds at the present time. I have before now expressed a not very high opinion of the House of Lords; but I always wish to be fair, and I think when the House of Lords does practical work we ought to give them encouragement by passing the Bills they send to us. Now, I should like to ask one or two questions as to Supply. It has been suggested that we shall have five days allotted to ordinary Supply and one day given to the Colonial Office Vote, and one each to the Foreign Office and War Office Votes; but I very much doubt whether one day will be sufficient for the Colonial Office Vote, because we have to deal not only with South Africa but several other matters—Ashanti, and so forth. With regard to the Foreign Office it is very desirable that some important discussion should take place before the House breaks up in regard to China. The right hon. Gentleman may say that we have the opportunity on the Supplementary Vote, and he also tells us that that is to cover money which is required for both China and South Africa. Such a discussion I do not think ought to be prolonged beyond twelve o'clock. The matter

is a large and important one, and we know very well that after twelve o'clock speeches are not reported, and the debate is somewhat perfunctory. If it goes over twelve o'clock, I hope the right hon. Gentleman will consent to give it another day. There is one other question. I do not ask him to give the precise figure of the Estimate, but I should like to ask the right hon. Gentleman to tell the House what his idea is with regard to the future, about what the amount is of the Vote that he intends to ask for, together with the amount that the Government has in hand, so that we might form an opinion as to whether we are going to have an autumn session, as is suggested in the press, or whether we are going to have no further session of this Parliament. This is a very interesting question, and we should like to have all the light which the right hon. Gentleman can throw upon it. We do not wish him to tell us whether he is going to advise Her Majesty to dissolve the Parliament in the autumn; but if he will tell us about the amount of the Estimate and what the amount of the borrowing powers of the Government are we should be very interested, and it might help us to reason the matter out.

*COLONEL MILWARD (Warwickshire, Stratford-on-Avon) said he required no information on the point just mentioned, because whether the dissolution came early or late he hoped that Ministers would be prepared to face the consequences. He desired to support the appeal of the hon. Member for South Leeds with reference to the Companies Bill, that it should not be brought on for Report unless there was time to consider it seriously. He quite appreciated the fact that the members of the Grand Committee, who had spent so much time upon it, would feel disappointed if it did not pass, and there were a great many others who would be equally disappointed. The hon. Member for Northampton suggested that there were certain Members who did not desire to see it pass. He was not one of those. He wished to see it pass, but after consideration and in such a shape that it would not be at once rendered a dead letter by the legal gentlemen outside Parliament, who were even now preparing to drive a four-horse coach through it. It was a Bill of enormous importance, even to the working classes of the Midlands, who at the time of the cycle boom, when many bogus companies were promoted, put their earnings into various companies. The Bill was only introduced on the 26th of June, and it was impossible in so short a time to consider it as it ought to be considered, and to form such a Bill as ought to pass. The labours of the Grand Committee had not been wasted, and the Government would, after consideration, be advised to take up certain points, and he thought that another year, by taking up the Bill earlier in the session, a more complete and valuable measure would result from their efforts.

MR. BUCHANAN (Aberdeenshire, E.) drew attention to the fact that on other occasions when this motion had been moved the right hon. Gentleman had stated that it was not the intention of Her Majesty's Government to keep the House late every night. Although the right hon. Gentleman had given no such intimation on the present occasion he trusted that the House might assume that that was the case now. He understood that the House was to have Supplementary Estimates brought before them during the present session; but if that was the case, he apprehended they would be in a difficulty with regard to the Colonial Vote, because, as he understood the programme, three extra days had been given for Supply. The Irish Estimates were to be given one day, and if the Colonial Vote and the Foreign Office Vote took another day each, there would be no time left to discuss the War Office or any other Vote. Having regard to the importance of the foreign affairs all over the world, he hoped further time would be given.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Several questions have been asked and many pledges have been demanded from me, and while I cannot say that I shall be able to gratify all those who have made remarks, I shall endeavour as well as I can to go seriatim through the list of questions. The hon. Member who has just sat down says he hopes the sittings will not be unduly prolonged. I am very reluctant to put undue strain upon the House, but, although I hope there will be no formidable amount of business of Supply or of late sittings, I am not able to give any specific promise to the House on the subject. As regards Supply, I have said that I would so arrange that there would be one additional day outside the twenty-three allotted days. I hope to do that. May

I point out to the hon. Gentleman, as far as the Foreign and Colonial Offices are concerned, that there will not only be an opportunity of discussing them on the ordinary Votes, but there will be an opportunity of discussing, at any rate, very large and important sections of these questions upon the Supplementary War Estimates which concern the granting of money for South Africa and money for China. In addition to these opportunities there is, of course, always the opportunity given by the different stages of the Appropriation Bill; and I am bound to say that that seems to me sufficient, even in view of the exceptional circumstances in which the House finds itself. I think the Leader of the Opposition was a little unjust when he suggested that an inadequate time had been already given to the discussions of the War Office Estimates. The immense amount of time given to those discussions this session must have escaped his attention. It has not been an undue amount, I agree. Undoubtedly the War Office has been the office above all others before the public, and on which discussion may seem most legitimate. But I have done my best to add up roughly the number of nights given to War Office discussions, and I cannot make them out to be less than seventeen. To give seventeen days in one session to the discussion of one Department is surely not unfair even in the eyes of those most greedy of discussion and most anxious to probe the War Office questions to the bottom. In this annual debate the Leader of the House finds himself a sort of target to be shot at from many different quarters. There are the gentlemen who say that all the Bills which have been passed are trumpery and trifling measures, and that it is the Bills about which there is any doubt which are the important measures, and measures which it would be monstrous to drop. Then there are those who say, "Though the Government's Bills may be all very well, look at the private Bills abandoned by the Government! Let the Government press on with those and the House will be satisfied." Then there is a third and the commonest class of all, who say, "Above all do not sit after twelve o'clock." And there are others who say, "However important it may be to pass this Bill or that, it is most important of all to give us an early holiday." All these appeals excite my sympathy, but they cannot all be gratified, if hon. Members will go to bed when the clock strikes twelve, if they will be up on the 1st of August, and if they will pass these great measures; these aspirations are evidently mutually contradictory and cannot all be satisfied even by the most ingenious arrangements of public business. And if they are contradictory aspirations and cannot all be satisfied, as manifestly they cannot, I do hope the Leader of the House may not be supposed to be in fault because he cannot make such arrangements as will enable hon. Gentlemen both to eat their cake and have it also. The hon. Member for Northampton wanted to know what the amount of the Supplementary Estimate was. My hon. friend the Under Secretary for War is not in the House, but the Estimate will be soon in the hands of hon. Members. I am afraid, however, that a disappointment is in store for the hon. Member for Northampton. The amount, even if I could give it down to the minutest fraction, would throw no light on the problem which interests him. The amount would be the same if the House of Commons were scattered to the winds in the next fortnight, or if it were to drag out a lingering existence to the last day allowed by the law. The Estimate has been framed wholly apart from those Parliamentary considerations which are so interesting to the hon. Member; and I am afraid that no light will be thrown upon them by the publication of the details for which the hon. Member is desirous. My noble friend the Member for the Chorley Division has made an appeal in favour of a Bill in which he is interested, and which has passed this House and the other House with only two or three trifling Amendments. Another Bill which has passed this House and in which only very small Amendments have been introduced in another place is the Bill giving compensation for accidents to agricultural labourers. It is evident that Bills of that character ought not to be sacrified, and I think it is quite usual and invariable, when the Government has asked for these special privileges, that such non-controversial private Bills should be starred and therefore escape from the drastic and destructive effects of the resolution which I now ask the House to pass. I notice that there are two Bills in the list which I read, which I hoped were non-controversial in their character, but with regard to which strong opposition has been an-

nounced in the course of the debate. One is the Diocesan Records Bill and another is an Irish Bill with respect to which the leader of the Nationalist party has declared his intention of moving an Amendment. [Mr. DILLON: The four Irish Bills are controversial.] Then I suppose the four Irish Bills will have to be dropped. The hon. Member for South-west Bethnal Green reproached the Government with having dropped the Lunacy Bill. I greatly regret that it has been dropped; and I quite recognise that there are important provisions which it is really most desirable to pass into law without delay. But the Bill is a long one. It contains a large number of miscellaneous administrative reforms which it is impossible to pass through the House without considerable discussion; and therefore it is with the greatest reluctance that I feel bound to adhere to the decision already come to not to press the measure on the attention of the House. I think I have dealt with almost every point which was raised, except the Companies Bill. I stated at the beginning of the debate that that is a Bill which I hope will be allowed to pass; and I see no reason why it should not pass. The right hon. Gentleman said that I had missed the most important element in my statement, because I refrained from giving any date for the probable adjournment of the House. That date can never be given with assurance, and it could be given with less assurance than ever this year, because there are not only the Bills which I have mentioned, but the financial proposals which have to be made, to be taken into account. I do not like to say within a day or hour—or even within several days—when the session will come to an end; but I shall be greatly disappointed if it does not end during the week beginning 5th August. I hope it will not be later than the ordinary time; it may be even earlier. I do not see why it should not, if the House sets to work in a businesslike fashion. It is true that the hon. Member for East Northamptonshire, who is peculiarly violent in his criticisms of the conduct of public business, said that it was outrageous that we should have had such long holidays at Easter and Whitsuntide; and he desired that we should get up on 1st August. When the hon. Member is Leader of the House he will find that ideal, though a delightful one, is not easy to realise. It is possible to induce the House to take fairly long holidays at Easter and Whitsuntide, and especially when they meet, as this year they have done, in January; but it is not possible to induce the House to get up on 1st August.

*MR. CHANNING: On the contrary, I offered to stop longer, to help pass Bills like the Companies Bill. I thought the House ought to stop longer. My suggestion was that the great Bills should be taken earlier in the session.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I demur from the hon. Gentleman on that point. The Bills we have taken earlier in the session are very important Bills—quite as important as any that remain, so that the only difference between us is that the hon. Member would have taken the Companies Bill before the Housing of the Working Classes Bill. It is a matter on which the hon. Member and myself are hardly likely to agree.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport): What about the point raised by the hon. Member for South-west Manchester, with respect to the funds of the Patriotic Commissioners?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: With all deference to my honourable friend, I do not think that it is very relevant to this discussion; but I think it is extremely likely that we shall be able to inform the House what our proposals are before the end of the session. But on that point I make no pledge. On the whole, I think the motion has not been unkindly received, even by the severest of our critics, and I hope that without a division we may now proceed to the ordinary business of the day.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 240; Noes, 114. (Division List No. 219.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.	Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John	Banbury, Frederick George
Aird, John	Bailey, James (Walworth)	Barry, Rt. Hn. A. H. S. (Hunts)
Allsopp, Hon. George	Baird, John George Alexander	Bartley, George C. T.
Arnold, Alfred	Balcarres, Lord	Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol)
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.	Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)	Beaumont, Wentworth, C. B.
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert H.	Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (Leeds)	Bethell, Commander

Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blakiston-Houston, John
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boulnois, Edmund
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Bullard, Sir Harry
Burt, Thomas
Butcher, John George
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J A (Glasgow
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbys.
Cecil, Evelyn (Hertford, E.)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J (Birm)
Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Charrington, Spencer
Chelsea, Viscount
Coddington, Sir William
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Chas. Ready
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cornwallis, Fiennes Stanley W.
Courtney, Rt. Hon. Leonard H.
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Crombie, John William
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton
Curzon, Viscount
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Donkin, Richard Sim
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Douglas-Pennant, Hon. E. S.
Dyke, Rt Hon Sir William Hart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Evershed, Sydney
Faber, George Denison
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn E.
Fergusson, Rt Hn Sir J (Manch'r
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Fitz Wygram, General Sir F.
Flower, Ernest
Foster, Colonel (Lancaster)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Gedge, Sydney
Gibbs, Hn. A G H (City of Lond.)
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Giles, Charles Tyrrell
Goldsworthy, Major-General
Gordon, Hon. John Edward
Gorst, Rt. Hon Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Rt Hn G. J (St George's
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gourley, Sir Ed. Temperley
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Green, Walford D. (Wed'sbury
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Gull, Sir Cameron
Gunter, Colonel
Hamilton, Rt. Hon. Lord George
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hanson, Sir Reginald
Hardy, Laurence
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Robt. Trotter
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, E. Brodie (Hampstead)
Hoare, Sir Samuel (Norwich)
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Houston, R. P.
Howard, Joseph
Howell, William Tudor
Howorth, Sir Henry Hoyle
Hozier, Hon. J. H. C.
Hughes, Colonel Edwin
Hutton, John (Yorks, N. R.)
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Jessel, Captain Herbert M.
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kay-Shuttleworth, Rt Hn Sir U
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. William
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Lafone, Alfred
Lawrence, Sir E Durning-(Corn
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks.)
Lea, Sir Thomas (Londonderry)
Lecky, Rt Hon William Edw. H.
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leighton, Stanley
Llewelyn, Sir Dillwyn-(Sw'ns'a
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowles, John
Lyttleton, Hon. Alfred
Macartney, W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall
M'Ewan, William
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Marks, Henry Hananel
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn W. F.
Mellor, Colonel (Lancashire)
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Mendl, Sigismund Ferdinand
Mesey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milward, Colonel Victor
Monckton, Edward Philip
Monk, Charles James
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, Hon. F. (Mon.)
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)
Mount, William George
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Philip A.
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.
Pease, Herbert P. (Darlington
Percy, Earl
Phillpotts, Captain Arthur
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, R. (Lancs., Newton
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Pollock, Harry Frederick
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Reid, Sir Robert Threshie
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, Rt. Hn. Sir Matthew W.
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Russell, Gen. F. S. (Cheltenham
Russell, T. W. (Tyrone)
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. E. J.
Savory, Sir Joseph
Scoble, Sir Andrew Richard
Seely, Charles Hilton
Seton-Karr, Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew
Sidebotham, J. W. (Cheshire)
Sidebottom, T. H. (Stalybr.)
Sidebottom, William (Derbysh
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Christchurch)
Smith, J. Parker (Lanarks)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spencer, Ernest
Stanley, Hon. A. (Ormskirk)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Sir H. M. (Lambeth)
Stewart, Sir M. J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strauss, Arthur
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ
Tennant, Harold John
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Lt.-Col. C. E. (Kent)
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E. (T'nt'n
Wharton, Rt. Hon. J. Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-under-L
Whitmore Charles Algernon
Williams, Jos. Powell- (Birm.
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, George
Wyvill, Marmaduke D'Arcy

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

braham, William(CorkN.E.)
llan, William (Gateshead)
llison, Robert Andrew
mbrose, Robert
therley-Jones, L.
ustin, M. (Limerick, W.)
arlow, John Emmott
ailey, Thomas (Derbyshire)
illson, Alfred
irrell, Augustine
lake, Edward
roadhurst, Henry
uchanan, Thomas Ryburn
urns, John
aldwell, James
arvill, Patrick G. Hamilton
hanning, Francis Allston
lark, Dr. G. B.
olville, John
ommins, Andrew
rean, Eugene
rilly, Daniel
urran, Thomas B. (Donegal)
urran, Thomas (Sligo, S.)
alziel, James Henry
ilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
illon, John
oogan, P. C.
uckworth, James
unn, Sir William
mmott, Alfred
vans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan
enwick, Charles
lavin, Michael Joseph
lynn, James Christopher
oster, Sir Walter (Derby Co)
oddard, Daniel Ford
riffith, Ellis J.
arwood, George
Hedderwick, Thomas Chas. H.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. CharlesH.
Hogan, James Francis
Holland, William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, DavidBrynmor (Swans')
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Langley, Batty
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cumb'l'nd
Lewis John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Macaleese, Daniel
MacDonnell, Dr. M. A. (Qn'sC.)
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
M'Dermott, Patrick
M'Ghee, Richard
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin
M'Leod, John
Maddison, Fred
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Mather, William
Moulton, John Fletcher
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Connor, Arthur (Donegal)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Kelly, James
O'Malley, William
Palmer, George W. (Reading)
Pickard, Benjamin
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pilkington, Sir G. A. (LancsS.W
Power, Patrick Joseph
Provand, Andrew Dryburgh
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Samuel, J. (Stockton-on-Tees)
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh
Shaw, Charles E. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Albert
Stanhope, Hon. Philip J.
Strachey, Edward
Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)
Sullivan, T. D. (Donegal, W.)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Alfred (Glamorgan, E.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John L. (Leeds, S.)
Wedderburn, Sir William
Weir, James Galloway
Whiteley, George (Stockport)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, John Carvell (Notts.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, John (Govan)
Wilson, Jos. H (Middlesbrough
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd
Woods, Samuel
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.

Ordered, That, for the remainder of the Session, Government Business be not interrupted under the provisions of any Standing Order regulating the Sittings of the House; and may be entered upon at any hour, though opposed, and that at the conclusion of Government Business each day Mr. Speaker do adjourn the House without Question put.

TITHE RENT-CHARGE (IRELAND) BILL.

Order for Third Reading read, and discharged.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the Bill be re-committed in respect of the New Clause (Exclusion of certain annuities and rent charges), and the Amendment to the Schedule."—(*Mr. G. W. Balfour.*)

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee) thought they had a right to complain of the way the House had been treated in respect of this Bill. When it was introduced it was understood that there would be a Report stage. There had been notice given of Amendments in respect of the matter on which it was now proposed to recommit the Bill. It was distinctly understood then that the Bill would be taken in the ordinary way on Report. There never was a Bill which more required to be subjected to the usual procedure of the House, for it was one of the most technical they had seen in this or any session of Parliament. He wished to refer to the point in regard to which it was proposed to recommit the Bill. It was a point on which the right hon. Gentleman got entirely into a mess when the Bill was in Committee. After refusing to accept his Amendment, the Attorney General for Ireland consented to consider the question before the Report stage. Now there was to be no Report stage. If they were to go into this question at all the House should have an opportunity of considering whether they preferred to keep the schedule intact and to strike out Clause 4, or to proceed in the way the right hon. Gentleman now proposed. For his part

he would prefer the schedule intact, because it specified the words of the Act of 1872 to be repealed, while the repealing clause did not so specify the words. The House was to be reduced to this process if the Government would not consent to recommit the Bill indefinitely and generally, but he hoped that at least an Amendment would be consented to which would give the House an opportunity of deciding between the repeal clause contained in the Bill and the repeal portion of the schedule.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.) moved to omit all words after "re-committed," in order to recommit the measure generally. The motion of the Chief Secretary, though not out of order, was very much out of ordinary form and routine. The motion of the right hon. Gentleman was to confine the effect of the re-committal to one clause only, and that a new clause. The records of Parliament could be searched in vain for the recommittal of a Bill on a new clause, and a new clause alone. The procedure now proposed to be adopted was altogether unprecedented. There were many Amendments the Irish Members had intended moving on the Report stage, some of them of vital importance. There was one in particular which the right hon. Gentleman the Attorney General promised to consider, and he gave the House to infer that his decision would be brought up on Report. But when a Bill passed through Committee without Amendment the Report stage as a matter of convenience was abrogated. That had happened in this case, but how? On the very first day on which the Bill was under discussion the hon. and learned Member for North Louth proposed several Amendments. Those Amendments were not accepted, but a pledge was given by the Chief Secretary that he would frame a clause and submit it to the House on the Report stage. The Bill was discussed at considerable length, and then at the last moment the right hon. Gentleman suddenly declined to move the Amendments standing in his name, thus avoiding the Report stage. Such a contrivance to bar discussion ought not to be used. The Government had resorted to an extraordinary process, which as a rule was used only when certain matters arose between the Committee stage and the Third Reading. What was useful for the Government should also be useful for the Opposition, and therefore he hoped the House would agree to recommit the Bill in regard to all matters. The Bill—a very technical one—had throughout been conducted in a very high-handed manner. There had been twenty divisions, four of which were on motions for the closure. On the Wednesday when the discussion had been closured, he drew the attention of the Chairman to the fact that by the main question being put in the form it was two most valuable Amendments would be shut out of all discussion. The Chairman admitted that that would be so. If the Bill was recommitted generally those Amendments could be reproduced and argued, and it was therefore only fair that such a course should be adopted. One Amendment especially was absolutely essential, as it raised the tremendous question of the construction of the statute. The Government would not dare to apply the procedure now proposed to any other than Irish Bills; but the high-handed conduct of the Government would, to some extent, be remedied by recommitting the Bill as a whole. If the right hon. Gentleman agreed to this he could rest assured the Irish Members would not abuse in the slightest degree the power thereby given. Not a single reason could be urged against the Amendment except that the Government desired to burke discussion and prevent the bringing forward of arguments revealing the true intent of the Bill. The course the Government were taking amounted almost to a breach of faith, but he hoped the Chief Secretary would agree to concede the point now asked.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the words from the word 're-committed,' to the end of the question."—(*Mr. Swift MacNeill.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland): I rise strongly to support the Amendment, not merely on grounds particular to this Bill itself, but on general grounds relating to the procedure of this House. At a preceding stage of this Bill I felt it my duty to enter my most solemn and even vehement protest against the action of the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the measure, and I assume that

The House appreciates the fact that the Government are to-night establishing an entirely new precedent. The motion that on the Third Reading a Bill should be recommitted is a motion not often made, but when the motion is made it is usually made in either of two contingencies—either when there is a general assent to the motion, or when the Government have found it necessary to make what is usually a literal correction in a Bill. There may be a third contingency in which such a motion would be justifiable, and that is when the Government find that through some oversight they have neglected to fulfil a pledge to any section of the House. But neither of these circumstances exists at the present moment. There is no unexpectedness in the matter; there is no mere literal change to be made; there is no general assent. What the Government have done is to employ what, without using the word offensively, I may describe as a device, the object being to escape from one of those stages of investigation and examination to which the wisdom of many centuries has decreed Bills should be subjected. In other words, the Government have adopted this device in order to do away with the Report stage of the Bill. That is a stage which has for centuries been regarded as one of the inevitable and necessary stages of a measure. I know of only two occasions on which that stage has been avoided. One was when the present Leader of the House was able to get an Education Bill through Committee without Amendment. That was a small Bill in many respects, and I do not intend to go back on the controversy. The other occasion was when a Bill was passed without Amendment through a Committee upstairs by a Member sitting on these benches, the Report stage being thus avoided. But I believe there was scarcely an evening for three months on which that hon. and learned Member was not indicted by hon. Gentlemen opposite for the unusual, unprecedented, and it was almost suggested, the indecent course he had adopted in getting the Bill through without accepting any Amendments, and I believe that that very act contributed finally to the rejection of the Bill in another place, because it was argued that a Bill passed through Committee in this indecently hasty way, without the acceptance of any rational Amendment, must have been so inadequately and scantily discussed that really that Chamber was only fulfilling its duty as a revising assembly in refusing to carry the Bill into law. I would remind the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary that the illustrious person who used this argument with such disastrous effect was the present Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, but now the very course which was used as an argument for rejecting that measure is being adopted by the right hon. Gentleman himself. This Bill is to be recommitted for the purpose of putting in a new clause which stood upon the Paper for several days. If the right hon. Gentleman could come down and say, "I want the Bill recommitted, because, since it passed through Committee, it has suddenly struck me that an improvement might be made in it," we would have nothing whatever to object to. But the right hon. Gentleman is in no such position, because the clause was upon the Paper for several days, and, in fact, was put there in fulfilment of a pledge given by the Government. We are therefore in this position: the Government are asking the House to take this unusual and wholly unprecedented course for the simple purpose of avoiding the Report stage. I strongly support my hon. and learned friend in the demand that if the Bill is re-committed at all it should be re-committed in its entirety, so that we may have the same rights of proposing Amendments as the Government now seek.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.E.) contended that something tantamount to a breach of faith had been committed by the Government. An undertaking was given across the floor of the House on the first night of the debate on this Bill that a new clause should be brought up later. It was not so brought up, but several days later it was placed on the Paper, and then at the last minute the Government forced the Bill through by a mechanical majority and amended their own hand. Instead of having the clause discussed in Committee they, in order to avoid the Report stage, had brought it forward in such a way that it could not be properly discussed. The arguments of the hon. and learned Member for North Louth on the first clause were such that they convinced the Government, and the Leader of the House promised a clause which should, if possible, meet the views which had been expressed. The clause

duly appeared on the Paper, but to the surprise of everybody, after having suspended the twelve o'clock rule, the Government withdrew their own clause, and it was now brought in in its present form. Under these circumstances, he trusted the House would support the Irish Members in objecting to a course which was not only unprecedented in the procedure of the House, but which unquestionably was not in accordance with the spirit of fair play and equity towards a minority in the House. The Irish people were deeply interested in this Bill, because it affected an Irish fund, and therefore they were justified in protesting against the action of the Government as uncandid, unfair, and tantamount to a breach of faith, breaking the spirit, if not the letter, of their own promise in regard to the most controversial point in the whole Bill. The course suggested in the Amendment was one in accordance with Parliamentary procedure, and it was more convenient that instead of recommitting the Bill in respect of a single new clause, it should be recommitted in respect of all the clauses around which so much discussion raged, and in respect of which the Government had refused to accept any Amendments.

*Mr. CARVELL WILLIAMS (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield): Although not an Irish Member, I think it right to join in the protest which has been made against what I deem to be the unfair treatment of the House by the Government in connection with this measure. The intention of the Chief Secretary was, no doubt, to move this clause in Committee, but he had been successful in securing the rejection of every Amendment proposed by the Irish Members, and I suppose it occurred to him then that, if he abandoned for the time this intended clause, he would succeed in getting rid of the Report stage. The temptation, I imagine, was too strong to be resisted, and now he comes to the House asking to enjoy an exceptional position, in submitting a clause which ought to have been moved in Committee, while the rest of the House are virtually deprived of the opportunity of submitting other Amendments which they might desire to propose. I think it right to call the attention of the House to the fact that this method of procedure, call it by what name you will, appears to be part of the settled policy of the present Government. It has happened in previous sessions, and it is happening now. It is sought to abolish the Report stage of Bills, avoid discussion, and to prevent Members exercising the full rights of membership of this House. Notably is this the case in regard to Bills which come from Standing Committees. The anomaly is greater in such cases, because the whole of the Members of the House, with the exception of those who are Members of the Standing Committees, are deprived of all opportunity of moving Amendments to Bills which are before the House. It is a quite common process for the Government, or anybody else in charge of a Bill, to move an Amendment on the final stage of the measure, but in such cases usually all Members of the House are placed on a footing of equality. But by this method the Government are curtailing the rights and privileges of Members of this House, and I think it is high time notice were taken of it, and that steps should be taken to prevent the continuance of such a policy in the future.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) said it could not be imputed as a fault to the Government that they had succeeded in persuading the Committee of the whole House to pass their Bill without amendment. But although that complaint was not quite justified by all the circumstances of the case, he could see no good reason why Her Majesty's Government could not accept this Amendment. It seemed to him that having arrived at this stage, and the Government having found it necessary for their own purposes to recommit the Bill, he thought it was only fair that the recommittal should be a general one. He was most anxious that every one and even the smallest of the privileges of hon. Members of the House should be maintained, and should be brought into operation to show that they were being maintained. Perhaps hon. Members opposite might once again be in power, and then he thought the House might require every safeguard in case mischievous proposals were submitted. In regard to what had been said about Grand Committees, he thought that the practice of sending measures to Grand Committees was a great abuse. If a Bill was not good enough to stand the criticism of a Committee of the whole House, it was not good enough to introduce into the House at all.

He hoped the Government would agree to make the recommittal a general one. If they recommitted the measure for a specific purpose only they might find it necessary in the course of discussion to go into other matters. When he looked at the last line of the only clause in respect of which it was proposed to recommit the Bill, he found that it dealt with a matter of considerable importance. Sub-section 4 of the new clause provided that—

"This section shall not extend to a mortgage or a marriage or other family settlement or arrangement."

If that was the only thing——

MR. SPEAKER: These are questions which will be in order when the new clause is before the Committee.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES said he only mentioned that to show that other questions might arise. He saw no reason why Her Majesty's Government should not accept this Amendment.

*SERJEANT HEMPHILL (Tyrone, N.): I do hope that if Her Majesty's Government do not accept this Amendment the House will carry it. I think it is quite a reasonable proposal, and Irish Members have great reason to complain of the course pursued by Her Majesty's Government in this respect. Three-fourths of the Members from Ireland are bitterly opposed to this Bill, and they represent the feelings of their constituencies. The Irish Members opposing this measure consist of three-fourths of the entire representation of Ireland, and they are the only people who ought to attempt to correct bad legislation or promote good legislation for Ireland. Three-fourths of the Irish representatives are opposed to this Bill, and throughout its various stages they have sought to make various Amendments. On the discussion of Amendments which were moved to the very first section of the Bill there was a great deal of argument, and it was pointed out that some gross injustice and some gross anomalies would follow from the operation of the first section of the measure as it was originally introduced. Several hours were taken up in the discussion of that section, which struck very much at the root of the principle of the whole Bill, and in order to shorten the discussion and get rid of the difficulty the right hon. Gentleman opposite stood up and said he would bring up a clause on Report which would meet the difficulties which had been raised. For my part, I confess that I was quite satisfied with that assurance, and I believe all my hon. friends below the gangway were quite satisfied. Then the Committee passed on to other Amendments, and to other clauses in the Bill. A discussion arose about repealing one section, and a difficulty was pointed out by the hon. and learned Member for Dundee. Again to shorten discussion and to hurry this Bill through the House in the face of the opposition of three-fourths of the Irish representatives, it was suggested that an amendment would be proposed and a new clause would be brought in by the Government dealing with the point in dispute upon the report stage. We were also quite satisfied with that assurance. Upon the fourth night of the discussion of this revolutionary and confiscatory proposal what happened? In the first place the twelve o'clock rule was suspended. We all know that the suspension of this rule drives a great many reasonable men away from the House, and it is an effectual way of throwing a wet blanket over the business. I make no secret of saying that legislation in that manner after twelve o'clock upon serious matters is a mere farce and delusion. Having closured the Bill on the fourth night no new clause is brought up and no Report stage becomes necessary, and by this ingenious strategy —and I believe in calling a spade a spade —the report stage of a very contentious Bill was avoided by Her Majesty's Government in order to force this obnoxious Bill down the throats of the unwilling Irish people. And now the Government come up with this new clause and invite its discussion. For the sake of fair play to hon. Members from Ireland, I hope hon. Gentlemen opposite will support the Amendment of my hon. friend the Member for South Donegal if the Government do not accept it, and thus allow Irish Members the benefit of having, as it were, a Report stage of this Bill.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs): I hope the Government will consent to make this recommittal of the Bill one of a general character. During the discussion of this measure we have seen the most reasonable Amendments

constantly rejected. Surely it is not right to lay down that whatever the results may be or whatever injustice may follow, a measure must be carried *verbatim et literatim* in the particular form in which it is presented to the House. What is the House of Commons for if it is not to be allowed to make even the smallest and most reasonable amendment in the Bill? I disagree with the hon. Gentleman opposite who has stated that there is not enough intelligence on this side of the House to draw up such an Amendment as may be necessary to improve this Bill. The fact of the matter is that it is not a want of intelligence on this side of the House, but the difficulty is a want of scruple on the other side of the House. Unfortunately, this is the case also with another Bill. It was only the other day that a Minister said upstairs that an Amendment should not be allowed because, if it were accepted, the Report stage would follow. Ever since the commencement of this Parliament the Government have tried to prevent Bills being altered in order to save the Report stage. I trust that the Government, from a sense of ordinary justice and fair play, will allow Irish Members to discuss the rest of the Bill in the light of this clause, for which it is now proposed to re-commit the Bill. It appears to me that we are entering upon courses that are dangerous and which are verging upon being of an unconstitutional character. Of course, the Government have acted according to the rules of the House in what they have done, but it is for them to consider and decide whether, in keeping themselves strictly in order, they have not transgressed the rules of fairness which ought to govern every Administration.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): I have to thank the hon. Member opposite for the support he has given us upon this Bill. The hon. Member for King's Lynn has reproached us in regard to our incapacity to persuade hon. Members opposite to support our Amendments, but how is that possible when hon. Members opposite were absent during the discussions, and only appeared when the division bell rang? I never met with a debater in Committee who was able to persuade hon. Members to forsake the smoke room, the tea room, or the terrace by the reasonableness of his Amendment, and we never had any large body of hon. Members opposite listening to us when the Bill was discussed, except on the last night when the rule was suspended. On many occasions I counted the number of Members present on the benches opposite during the discussions, and they generally numbered about six. You cannot persuade the party opposite as to the reasonableness of any Amendments when there are only six of them present. It has been said that we have had a good many cases during the administration of the present Government of Bills being forced through the Committee *verbatim et literatim* for the purpose of avoiding the Report stage. In the case of this Bill a totally new practice has been instituted. In all previous cases, as far as my memory carries me, when a Bill was forced through the Committee without the alteration of a word or a comma, it was forced through on the ground that the Minister in charge maintained that no reasonable Amendment had been proposed by the Opposition. That was the only ground which could be put forward, What is the present case? That is not the ground in the present instance, because on the very first night of our debate the Government admitted that a reasonable Amendment had been proposed, and they promised to bring up a new clause during the Committee stage of the Bill. Although at a later date they refused all our Amendments, they admitted that upon this particular occasion the point raised was worthy of their consideration, and would be dealt with during the Report stage. But what have the Government done now? In this respect they have started an absolutely new practice in this House. Having promised to meet these difficulties, when they saw themselves in sight of the promised land of no Report stage, they immediately withdrew their promises, and they sought by a dodge or a piece of strategy to sweep away and abolish the Report stage, because they saw that these Amendments could be put in by a recommittal of the Bill. I say that is an absolutely unheard-of practice. Hitherto, when the Government have admitted the necessity of an Amendment, they have been bound to deal with it in Committee or upon Report stage. This practice is one which may have very extraordinary developments. What is there to prevent a Radical Government doing the same

hing? What is there to prevent a Government admitting that five, six, or en Amendments may be necessary in Committee, and saying they will consider hem on the Report stage, and then orcing the Bill through without an Amendment, and thus escaping the Report stage by proposing a recommittal of he Bill? This is a deliberate attempt, for he first time in the history of the House of Commons, to cheat hon. Members, because we are a small minority, out of he rights which the Standing Orders of this House have given to us. That s a serious charge to make, but it is a perfectly true charge, and if this practice is persisted in it may be the starting point of an absolutely new practice. We have lost one or two stages of Bills already. The First Reading of a Bill is always taken under he ten minutes rule, and we are now hreatened with a total abolition of the Report stage. If the present procedure is tolerated we shall soon be within measurable distance of a condition of things when there will only be the Second Reading and Committee stages of a Bill, with the possibility of a recommittal. I am surprised to see Conservative Members and a Conservative Government taking such an active part in this mode of procedure. It has been said that a time may come when you will do what you accused the Volksraad of doing—namely, the flinging down of a Bill upon he Table of the House and passing a resolution, and then claiming that that resolution has the power of law. I shall not be surprised if I live to see the day when the Government will walk down to his House, place a Bill on the Table, and move "That this Bill be now made the law of the land." I think it is quite time that hon. Members of this House realised he position into which they are drifting. I do not think it will be in order now to deal with the nature of the recommittal, or discuss the question as to whether there ought to be a complete recommittal of the Bill. The Government motion is a curious one, and it reads as follows—

"To commit the Bill in respect of a new clause, and an Amendment to the schedule."

I think that motion is slovenly drafted, because we do not know what the Amendment is. I should like to know, when a Bill is recommitted in respect of an Amendment, are we entitled to move any other Amendment? Is the Bill recommitted entirely, or are we confined to the Amendment which actually stands on the Paper?

*MR. SPEAKER: Discussion is confined to the clause standing on the Paper.

MR. DILLON: What I am not clear about is whether after the Bill is recommitted we shall be empowered to move any other Amendment. Supposing we were to recommit the Bill in respect to a particular clause, would it be open to us to move any Amendment to that clause? When we recommit this Bill in respect to a particular Amendment have we the right to amend that Amendment? What I have to say in reference to the nature of the Government proposal will, of course, more fittingly come when the proposal of the Government is made. I have only this further remark to make, and it is that I distinctly understood the right hon. Gentleman to promise that this matter would be considered and dealt with on the Report stage, and as regards the words of the Chief Secretary there is no mistake about them, for he distinctly promised that the new clause would be dealt with in Committee at the end of the Bill.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.) said that the question referred to was the repealing of a certain clause under the Act of 1872, and what was promised was that if it was not already repealed a proposal to that effect would be made by the Government. Upon looking carefully into the matter he found that Clause 32 was repealed, and there was no necessity to introduce another clause.

MR. DILLON said that what the Government had done on the present occasion had never been done in the House of Commons before, and upon that ground he strongly supported the Amendment of his hon. friend the Member for South Donegal. He hoped they would obtain the support of all hon. Members opposite who did not wish to see the procedure upon Bills in the House deprived of certain safeguards.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I may say that my own personal view is that I do not like the practice of passing Bills through Grand Committee and then simply asking the House to pass the Third Reading, when the House as a whole has had no opportunity of doing

more than give its general assent. But it cannot be urged in the case of this Bill that the House has had no opportunity of discussing its details. For four nights we have listened to the same old arguments, dressed up in the same old words, upon the details of the Bill, forming the most striking example of Parliamentary endurance that my recollection of House of Commons procedure furnishes. Hon. Gentlemen opposite have thought fit to attack the Government for what they choose to regard as something in the nature of a breach of faith, or a violation of the privileges of the House. One would suppose that hon. Gentleman opposite were an oppressed minority, struggling against an unscrupulous and tyrannical Government; but the circumstances are exactly reversed. All the patience has been on our side, and all the wrong has been suffered by us. I do not wish to enter into any recriminations. I have had countless bargains across the floor of the House with hon. Gentlemen opposite when I was in much more acute political antagonism with them than I now am, and I have never had reason for complaint until the other night. I am perfectly certain hon. Gentlemen do not think they have agreed to and broken any bargain, or that they have any suspicion of an arrangement with the Government regarding the conduct of the Committee on this Bill; but the impression left on my mind is that the hon. and learned Member for North Louth made a proposal which is now substantially embodied in the clause on the Paper, and suggested that, in consideration of the Government adopting his view, the proceedings on the Bill would be shortened, and he went so far as to suggest that they might even finish that night, and that the proposal of the Chief Secretay might be discussed on the Thursday. But the hon. Member for East Mayo then said, as was quite true, that the hon. and learned Member for North Louth had no right to bind the whole of the party. I then quite recognised that a too rigid interpretation ought not to be put on the suggestion of the hon. and learned Member for North Louth, and that the debate might go on on the Wednesday, and that we would be able to bring up the new clause at a convenient hour on Thursday. As far as I know, nothing more was said, and the matter was left there. I do not wish to use the word "obstruction" at all, nor to have any controversy with hon. Gentlemen opposite, but the very moment the arrangement or the supposed arrangement was concluded they began to discuss the Bill with an assiduity, a perseverance and a power even of repetition which carried the discussion of the Bill not only over Tuesday and Wednesday and Thursday, but until about half-past two o'clock on the Monday night. Thus, in making our concession to the hon. and learned Member for North Louth the Government have got no consideration. We had no desire to see this Amendment introduced. We offered it for value, and we never got the value. Therefore, if there is any complaint, and I am very far from making any complaint, it is on the side of the Government, and not on the side of hon. Members opposite.

DR. AMBROSE (Mayo, W.): We have just listened to one of the most extraordinary speeches which the House has heard during this session. The right hon. Gentleman has thought fit to criticise the speeches of the Irish Members on this very important Bill, and to say that they were repetitions. I should have thought that the more honourable course for the Government to adopt would be, as preliminary to the dissolution, to make it known to all concerned that the Tory Government—the strongest and most intelligent ever seen in this House—were granting relief to the Irish landlords. That would be making a clean breast of it. I must protest against the manner in which the Government have endeavoured to avoid discussion on the Report stage of this Bill.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 116; Noes, 81. (Division List No. 220.)

AYES.

Arnold, Alfred	Bullard, Sir Harry	Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John	Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.	Colomb, Sir J. Charles Ready
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r	Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire	Cook, Fred. Lucas (Lambeth)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds	Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich	Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Barry, Rt. Hn. A. H. S. (Hunts.)	Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.	Cornwallis, Fiennes Stanley W.
Bartley, George C. T.	Chamberlain, J. A. (Worc'r.)	Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol	Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry	Cruddas, William Donaldson
Blakiston-Houston, John	Charrington, Spencer	Curzon, Viscount
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John	Clare, Octavius Leigh	Dalrymple, Sir Charles

Mr. A. J. Balfour.

Donkin, Richard Sim
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Hart
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Flower, Ernest
Foster, Colonel (Lancaster)
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Goldsworthy, Major-General
Gordon, Hon. John Edward
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Green, Walford D (Wednesbury
Greene, H. D. (Shrewsbury)
Hamilton, Rt. Hn. Lord George
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robt. Wm.
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Henderson, Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Robert T.
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, R. P.
Howard, Joseph
Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Lawrence, Sir E Durning-(Corn
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks.)
Leighton, Stanley
Llewelyn, Sir Dillwyn-(Swans.
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Lowe, Francis William
Macartney, W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Iver, Sir L. (Edinburgh, W.
Mellor, Colonel (Lancashire)
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Milward, Colonel Victor
Monckton, Edward Philip
Monk, Charles James
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, Hon. F. (Monm'thsh.
Morrison, Walter
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford
Mount, William George
Muntz, Philip A.
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute
Nicol, Donald Ninian
O'Connor, Arthur (Donegal)
Percy, Earl
Phillpotts, Captain Arthur
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, R. (Lancs. Newton)
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Rentoul, James Alexander
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Russell, T. W. (Tyrone)
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. T. Myles
Saunderson, Rt Hn. Col. Edw. J.
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sidebotham, J. W. (Cheshire)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Abel H. (Christchurch)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spencer, Ernest
Stanley, Hon Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward J. (Somerset)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Vincent, Sir E. (Exeter)
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Welby, Lt-Col A. C. E (Taunton
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-under-L.
Williams, J. Powell- (Birm.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R (Bath)
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Sir William Walrond and
Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N.E.)
Allan, William (Gateshead)
Ambrose, Robert
Austin, M. (Limerick, W.)
Barlow, John Emmott
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Augustine
Blake, Edward
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Colville, John
Commins, Andrew
Crean, Eugene
Crilly, Daniel
Curran, Thomas B. (Donegal)
Curran, Thomas (Sligo, S.)
Dalziel, James Henry
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dillon, John
Doogan, P. C.
Duckworth, James
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gourley, Sir Edw. Temperley
Griffith, Ellis J.
Harwood, George
Hedderwick, Thomas C. H.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Jones, David Brynmor (Swans'a
Jones, William (Carnarvons.)
Langley, Batty
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cumb'l'nd
Lewis, John Herbert
Macaleese, Daniel
MacDonnell Dr MA (Queen'sC.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
M'Dermott, Patrick
M'Ghee, Richard
M'Leod, John
Maddison, Fred
Molloy, Bernard Charles
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Kelly, James
O'Malley, William
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Power, Patrick Joseph
Provand, Andrew Dryburgh
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Samuel, J. (Stockton-on-Tees)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Tanner, Charles Kearns
Tennant, Harold John
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Wallace, Robert
Wedderburn, Sir William
Weir, James Galloway
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, John Carvell (Notts.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, Jos. H. (Middlesbro')
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Captain Donelan and Mr.
Patrick O'Brien.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill re-committed in respect of the New Clause (Exclusion of certain annuities and rent-charges), and the Amendment to the Schedule.

Bill considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER, Cumberland, Penrith, in the Chair.]

A Clause—

"(1) Section one of this Act shall not apply to any annual sum charged upon land the fee simple of which has after the creation of such charge and before the thirteenth day of April one thousand eight hundred and ninety-six been conveyed to a purchaser on a sale.

"(2) Sections three and four of this Act shall not apply to any tithe rent-charge payable to the Land Commission out of hereditaments the fee simple of which has after the tenth day of August one thousand eight hundred and seventy-two and before the

twelfth day of May one thousand eight hundred and ninety-nine been conveyed to a purchaser on a sale.

"(3) For the purpose of showing that this section does not apply a statutory declaration or such other evidence as the Land Commission may require shall be *prima facie* evidence.

"(4) This section shall not extend to a mortgage or a marriage or other family settlement or arrangement."—(*Mr. G. W. Balfour.*)

—brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

MR. FLYNN: May I ask the Chief Secretary to explain what is meant by this clause?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. G. W. BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): The principle of the clause is that purchasers purchasing after certain dates may be supposed to have purchased with notice of change, and consequently they should not be entitled to benefit under the Bill. There are really three parties to be considered: the vendor, the purchaser of the estate, and the Church Fund. Strictly speaking, it is to the vendor that the benefit should go, but that is not possible, and it remains, therefore, to decide whether the Church Fund or the purchaser shall have the benefit. The clause provides that the benefit shall be given to the Church Fund rather than to the purchaser. The date mentioned in the first sub-section is the date on which the Land Bill of 1896 was introduced, when notice was given to all and sundry that the Government proposed to reduce the annuities to be discharged by the Land Commission from fifty-two years to forty-five. The second date mentioned in the second sub-section is the date of the introduction of the Tithe Rent Bill last year, which might be taken as notice to purchasers that the change we are now making by this Bill would be introduced. I think there is a great deal to be said for the proposal of the Member for North Louth, and I recognised that when I undertook to put down this Amendment; but I think it is rather doubtful if the additional gain to the Church Fund will be balanced by the introduction of a complicating provision.

MR. DILLON: The right hon. Gentleman seems to be awaking for the first time to the fact that the complications of this Bill are a matter of some concern. The Bill is complicated from beginning to end. The proper way to have dealt with the subject would have been by a Bill of one short simple clause making a charge on the Church Fund of a million and a half of money to be expended among the Irish landlords. That would carry out the proposal in the present Bill without any complications, and that has been the practice adopted with reference to other charges on the Fund, such as the charge for Intermediate Education and the Congested Districts Board.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Gentleman is now discussing the whole Bill.

MR. DILLON: I am not discussing the whole Bill. I am merely referring to the complaint of the Chief Secretary that a fresh complication has been introduced. It is equivalent to suggesting that by throwing a bucket of water into the sea there is danger of creating a flood.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member is reverting to a discussion of the Bill, which he says is complicated. He must confine himself to the one clause before the Committee.

MR. DILLON: I have no desire to enter on a discussion of the whole Bill at all. I was pointing out, in reply to an argument used by the right hon. Gentleman himself, that really an additional complication is of no matter. May I point out to the right hon. Gentleman that he has passed over altogether Sub-section 4, which I confess I am absolutely unable to understand. It says: "This section shall not extend to a mortgage or a marriage"——

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: "Or other family settlement or arrangement."

MR. DILLON: I am still in doubt as to its purport. What has a mortgage got to do with a tithe rent-charge? The Attorney General for Ireland laughs scornfully, but I am only an ignorant layman and really I cannot understand the meaning of this sub-section. It is all very well for Gentlemen learned in the law to sneer, but any ordinary Member of the House of Commons is perfectly entitled to the explanation I now ask for.

MR. ATKINSON: The sub-section provides for the exclusion of a mortgage or a marriage or other family settlement

from this section. It would be ridiculous because a mortgage was made in 1872 that the owner of the land should be prevented from having his tithe fixed now, or that the existence of a family settlement should have a similar result.

*SIR J. COLOMB (Great Yarmouth) said he only rose to ask a question, but as the Ministerial Bench was empty he did not see the use of putting his question at that time, and would therefore defer it.

MR. FLYNN said that as he understood the clause it would not apply to the annuities and tithe rent-charges before 1896. It applied to the annuities and tithe rent-charges created after the 13th April, 1896. The exclusion could not apply to those who purchased under the Land Purchase Act, because the Act of 1886 made their position clear, but it did apply to a section of purchasers to whom attention had been drawn in the earlier stages of the Bill—namely, those persons who purchased the holdings over the heads of the tenants who were seeking to purchase under the 40th section of the Land Purchase Act. They got the benefit of the reduction of the tithe rent-charge, as also did insurance companies who foreclosed upon the estate of a tenant proprietor who got into difficulties and became the owners of it. Those surely should be excluded. There was another class of purchaser who ought also to be excluded. Cases like that of Lord Ardilaun, for instance, who would get all the benefit of the reduction of the tithe rent-charge, because he purchased his estate after the date mentioned in the section. But the estate was purchased subject to the tithe rent-charge, and with the full knowledge that that charge was a certain sum, and the owner never supposed there would be another large reduction of the tithe rent-charge. Yet it was intended to give this wealthy family—who purchased the property to obtain a status in the country, more than anything else—the full benefits of the reduction, or, in other words, to present them, out of the Irish Church Fund, with seven years tithe rent-charge. Was it reasonable that Lord Ardilaun should get the benefit of an Act which, whether it was good or bad, was certainly never intended to relieve people of that class? The tenant purchasers could not be interfered with, they were not damnified in any way, but there were many estates to which it was thought and hoped the 40th section would apply to which it had not applied, and the poor unfortunate tenants had been chivied from one place to another. There were some cases where the offer of the tenant had not been considered enough, and another person, having the knowledge of the amount the tenant had offered, was allowed to purchase the property over his head, with the full knowledge of what the tithe-rent charge was, and he also got the benefit of this Act.

Attention called to the fact that forty Members were not present (Mr. FLAVIN, Kerry, N.). House counted, and, forty Members being found present—

MR. FLYNN said he was convinced that the clause did not meet the views of the hon. Member for North Louth, who had taken objection on the last occasion, and therefore he begged to move the Amendment standing in his name.

*THE CHAIRMAN pointed out that before the Amendment could be moved the clause must be read a second time.

MR. FLYNN said that large landowners were certainly not entitled to the benefits of the Act which had been introduced for the purpose of assisting poor landlords, and under the circumstances he hoped the Committee would not pass the clause.

*SIR J. COLOMB said that he would now take the opportunity of putting a question to which he had referred earlier in the evening. The tenants who had purchased under the Ashbourne Act, and were paying the tithe rent-charge, would by the operation of this Bill be excluded from any benefit they would otherwise obtain if the clause passed, and if that was so they would not feel any obligation to hon. Gentlemen opposite through whose attitude the clause was initiated. If the clause was going to operate in that way he asked that it might be withdrawn.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR said that the hon. Gentleman had stated that any tenant purchaser who had purchased under the 40th Clause of the Land Purchase Act, and at the same time had not redeemed the tithe, would lose all benefit under the Bill. He did not know there were many of those cases, although undoubtedly there were some. The general practice had been to redeem the

tithe at the time of purchase. He had no desire to press the clause, which he had only brought forward because he had given an undertaking to do so. If hon. Gentlemen opposite were of opinion that there was no benefit in it he should certainly not press it.

*SERJEANT HEMPHILL thought the clause was a good one in principle, although, when it had been read a second time, there were one or two Amendments to which he should call attention. He believed there would be a great deal of disappointment in Ireland if the clause were to be withdrawn, and although it wss not so perfect as he would have liked to have seen it he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would proceed to the Second Reading of the clause.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR said there was no use in proceeding with the Second Reading of the clause after the expression of opinion opposite.

*SERJEANT HEMPHILL said as he understood the remarks of the hon. Gentleman below the gangway, he had no desire to withdraw the clause altogether.

MR. FLYNN disclaimed any intention to object to the clause. All he was doing was pointing out a few of its defects.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS was of opinion that this was not a question for Irish Members alone. The clause as it stood increased the security of the British taxpayer. Though he should support the clause as it stood, he should also support the Amendment of the hon. Member for North Cork, for the reason that he failed to understand why those who purchased a month or two ago should be placed in a better position than those who purchased in earlier years. He thought that the clause might be accepted by everybody, but at the same time hon. Members had a right to endeavour to amend what appeared to be a very great blot upon it. Why should those who purchased within the last few months be placed in a better position than those who purchased ten or fifteen years ago? The dividing line ought to be the date of the Bill.

MR. POWER (Waterford, E.), who was indistinctly heard, said very few of those who purchased under the Land Purchase Bill would be affected, for the reason that it was the invariable practice of the Land Commission to take twenty years purchase for the tithes, and it was only in very few cases that the tenant proprietors were liable for the tithe rent-charge. With regard to the Amendments which had been made, they were naturally anxious to preserve the fund from being frittered away for purposes for which it was not intended.

Question put and agreed to.

*SERJEANT HEMPHILL said he had given notice of an Amendment which was not on the Paper. His right hon. and learned friend would recollect that the Tithe Rent-charge Act applied not only to fee simple land but also to what was described in the Tithe Rent-charge Act as equivalent estates in land. The clause in this Bill as it now stood would only apply to fee simple land, and the object of his Amendment was to make it apply also to equivalent estates.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 2, after the word 'which,' to insert the words 'or any estate equivalent to a perpetual estate or interest within the meaning of 1 and 2 Vic., c. 109.'"—(*Serjt. Hemphill.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. ATKINSON said he did not see any objection to his hon. friend's Amendment, but at the same time the words of the Amendment would have to be altered.

*SERJEANT HEMPHILL said if the right hon. Gentleman could suggest more appropriate words he would not at all object.

Amendment agreed to.

MR. FLYNN, in moving the Amendment standing in his name, said that he thought the insertion of the date was a matter that would give the benefits of the Act to those for whom they were not intended. Those who purchased after 13th April, 1896, would get the benefit of the reduction of the tithe rent-charge by seven years' instalments. He was anxious to get to the Third Reading of the Bill, and therefore he would content himself with moving the Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 2, to leave out from the word

'charge' to the word 'been,' in line 4."—(*Mr. Flynn.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

MR. G. W. BALFOUR, in opposing the Amendment, stated that a purchaser of an estate must be assumed to have had full notice of the charges upon it. In 1896 the principle was laid down that the term of fifty-two years would be reduced to forty-five, and those who purchased estates subsequently expected that reduction. That was a consideration which ought to be taken into account. It appeared to him that all the arguments that might be urged against the clause as a whole might also be urged against this limitation of the clause.

MR. DILLON said the position taken up by the right hon. Gentleman was very singular. He said that on the Second Reading of the Bill in 1896 he stated in the course of his speech that it was the intention of the Government to alter the condition with regard to the fifty-two annual instalments, and to knock off seven years, and that therefore a purchaser coming after that date had due notice of the intention of the Government. A more preposterous objection never was submitted to the House of Commons. He would illustrate the absurdity of the position. He held in his hand the famous Treasury Memorandum with respect to tithe rent-charge in Ireland, which was issued on 19th August, 1895, and signed by R. W. Hanbury, the present Secretary to the Treasury. That was far more important than the speech of the Chief Secretary for Ireland in that House. The Memorandum pointed out that it would be most unjust and unreasonable to expect that the fifty-two years instalments would be reduced. The thing was dealt with in an argumentative fashion, and the Treasury put down its foot and announced in a solemn form in a Memorandum that they would not reduce the fifty-two years instalments. The Treasury gave reasons, which he need not again read out, why it would be unjust and inexpedient to consent to this reduction. The position of the right hon. Gentleman was this: although the British Treasury issued this solemn Memorandum, the speech he subsequently made threw overboard the Treasury, and announced that the then Government had the intention of reducing the instalments. That was a perfectly preposterous contention, and he could not understand how the right hon. Gentleman proposed to base so important a clause, or provision in this new clause, on such a flimsy argument as that. He knew himself two cases that would be affected by this clause, and there might be others. There had not been many sales of land on a large scale since 1896. The cases he referred to were connected with the estates of Lord Ardilaun and the Duke of Devonshire. This proposal of the right hon. Gentleman would have the effect of exempting Lord Ardilaun from the provisions of the section—in other words, of giving Lord Ardilaun the advantage of the clause. That was a very extraordinary thing to do for Lord Ardilaun, but it said a great deal for the Christian charity of the right hon. Gentleman. Lord Ardilaun was worth a million and a half of money.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: More than that.

MR. DILLON: Say a couple of millions. He purchased a large estate in Killarney, but the extraordinary thing was that he also purchased the *Daily Express* with part of his money, and it was pouring out on the right hon. Gentleman the most vile abuse. The right hon. Gentleman was insisting on this proviso in spite of the fact that Lord Ardilaun devoted a large sum of money to opposing him. He (Mr. Dillon) trusted that his hon. friend would persist in the Amendment and go to a division upon it.

*SERJEANT HEMPHILL said that this Amendment was really important. The Amendment could not possibly affect those who purchased under the Act of 1896, because their tithe rent-charge was fixed under that Act. Therefore, the section about reducing the term from fifty-two years to forty-five years would not apply to them, because they were not interested in annuities terminable at the end of fifty-two years. If they looked at the Act they would see how the matter stood. The Land Purchase Act of 1887, in Section 15, provided that the Land Commission might, if they thought it expedient, order the redemption of any tithe rent-charge at a price to be fixed by the Land Commission, and that they might also order (Subsection 3) that any such redemption of

tithe rent-charge payable to the Commission should be made, without the previous consent of the Commissioners, to the Treasury. The Act of 1896, Section 37, provided that where the Land Commission, in pursuance of Section 15 of the Land Act of 1887, ordered the redemption of tithe rent-charge at a price of not less than twenty times the amount of such tithe rent-charge, the consent of the Treasury should not be required for such redemption. The Act further provided that the foregoing enactment should not apply to any annual sum payable under Section 32 of the Irish Church Act, 1869, and as amended by any other Act; but the Land Commission might order the redemption of such tithe rent-charge at a sum calculated on the basis of the annual sum, being for the term of forty-five instead of fifty-two years. That was where, he apprehended, the forty-five years period was got. Any tenant who bought under that Act had the tithe redeemed on these terms and was subject only to the annual charge, which was terminable at the expiration of forty-five years and not fifty-two years. He thought that completely disposeed of any objection there could be to this Amendment.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 122; Noes, 88. (Division List No. 221.)

AYES.

Arnold, Alfred
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Man)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds
Barry, Rt Hn A H Smith-(Hunts
Bartley, George C. T.
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol
Blakiston-Houston, John
Bond, Edward
Brassey, Albert
Bullard, Sir Harry
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbys.)
Cecil, Evelyn (Hertford, East)
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Ch. Ready
Cook, Fred. Lucas (Lambeth)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Cornwallis, Fiennes Stanley W.
Cross, Herbert S. (Bolton)
Cruddas, William Donaldson
Curzon, Viscount
Dalkeith, Earl of
Donkin, Richard Sim
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Fellowes, Hn. Ailwyn Edward
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robt. Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Flower, Ernest
Foster, Colonel (Lancaster)
Garfit, William
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Goldsworthy, Major-General
Gordon, Hon. John Edward
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, George J. (Sussex)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Gull, Sir Cameron
Hamilton, Rt. Hon Lord George
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Robert Trott'r
Hobhouse, Henry
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, R. P.
Hutton, John (Yorks., N. R.)
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Lawrence, Sir E Durning-(C'rn.
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks.)
Leighton, Stanley
Llewelyn, Sir Dillwyn-(Swans.
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowles, John
Macartney, W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
Mellor, Colonel (Lancashire)
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Monckton, Edward Philip
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morrison, Walter
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)
Mount, William George
Muntz, Philip A.
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Peel, Hn. Wm. Rbt. Wellesley
Phillpotts, Captain Arthur
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Pollock, Harry Frederick
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, Rt. Hon. Sir M. W.
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel W.
Round, James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Russell, T. W. (Tyrone)
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thos. Myles
Saunderson, Rt. Hon. Col. E. J.
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sidebotham, J. W. (Cheshire)
Sidebottom, T. Harrop (Stalyb.
Sidebottom, William (Derbysh.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Christchurch)
Smith, James P. (Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spencer, Ernest
Stanley, Hon. A. (Ormskirk)
Stephens, Henry Charles
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strauss, Arthur
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. M.
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E. (Tn't'n)
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Wharton, Rt. Hon. J. Lloyd
Williams, Jos. Powell- (Birm
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wodehouse, Rt, Hn. E. R. (Bath
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Sir William Walrond and
Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)
Allan, William (Gateshead)
Allison, Robert Andrew
Ambrose, Robert
Austin, M. (Limerick, W.)
Barlow, John Emmott
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Augustine
Blake, Edward
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Commins, Andrew

Serjeant Hemphill.

Crean, Eugene
Crilly, Daniel
Curran, Thomas B. (Donegal)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dillon, John
Doogan, P. C.
Duckworth, James
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Evershed, Sydney
Fenwick, Charles
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gourley, Sir Edward Temperley
Griffith, Ellis J.
Harwood, George
Hazell, Walter
Hedderwick, Thomas Chas. H.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon Charles H.
Holland, William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jones, David B. (Swansea)
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
Langley, Batty
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cumb'land
Lewis, John Herbert
Macaleese, Daniel
MacDonnell, Dr. M. A. (Qu'sC.)
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall
M'Dermott, Patrick
M'Ghee, Richard
M'Leod, John
Maddison, Fred.
Molloy, Bernard Charles
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Connor, Arthur (Donegal)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Kelly, James
O'Malley, William
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pilkington, Sir G. A (Lancs S. W.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Provand, Andrew Dryburgh
Redmond, J. E. (Waterford)
Rickett, J. Compton
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Samuel, J. (Stockton-on-Tees)
Shaw, T (Hawick Burghs)
Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)
Sullivan, T. D. (Donegal, W.)
Tanner, Charles Kearns
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Walton, J. Lawson (Leeds, S.)
Wason, Eugene
Wedderburn, Sir William
Williams, John Carvell (Notts.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, John (Govan)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.

MR. FLYNN moved to omit the words "the twelfth day of May one thousand eight hundred and ninety-nine" in order to insert "the passing of this Act." The section was to apply to all rent-charges created since a certain date and before the 12th May, 1899. The reason given for selecting the latter date was that last year the Government stated their intention of bringing in a Tithes Bill, and therefore the benefit of the reduction of the tithe rent-charge should be given to all who purchased after that date. The announcement of the introduction of a Tithes Bill was made by the Chief Secretary, who was not even a member of the Cabinet; and surely it was stretching the doctrine of Ministerial responsibility much too far to argue that that was a sufficient reason for saying that those who purchased since that date should receive the benefits of the Act. How did the purchasers know the present Government would remain in power, or that, after their experience in regard to the agricultural rates, they would have the temerity to go on with such a measure as the present, which was nothing more nor less than taking money from a public fund and handing it over to the Irish landlords? The Nationalist Members desired to limit the harm to be done by the Bill as much as possible, and to give the benefits to purchasers since May, 1899, was an altogether unnecessary extension of the provision. The only argument put forward in defence of the proposal was that on that date the Chief Secretary made a speech in reference to a Bill which was not proceeded with But how many people read the right hon. Gentleman's speeches? It was absurd to suppose that the whole of the population of Ireland read the speeches of the Chief Secretary, and, while the Bill bristled with absurdities, this topped everything. The Amendment was very reasonable and moderate, and should commend itself to the Committee, even if it did not to the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 8, to leave out from the word 'before,' to the word 'been,' in line 9, and insert the words 'the passing of this Act,' instead thereof."—(*Mr. Flynn.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

MR. G. W. BALFOUR said the principle of the clause depended entirely on the fact that on a certain date purchasers of land received notice that it was the intention of the Government to make certain changes which were included in this Bill. It had been urged that he attached undue importance to his speeches, but when he made the announcement referred to he was expressing not merely his own view, but the deliberate opinion of the Cabinet on the subject. Under those circumstances it was absurd to maintain that purchasers of land would not purchase having regard to what the Government intended to do in respect of tithes.

MR. DILLON contended that the principle laid down by the Chief Secre-

tary, that the announcement of the intentions of the Government was to be taken as governing the price of a commodity, was one entirely unheard of. To say that if a Minister made an announcement of an intention of the Government that was absolute proof that that intention would be carried out was most extraordinary. The fate of Governments was very uncertain, and even the present Administration with its great majority had broken down in the attempt to carry out certain intentions they had announced with much more solemnity than was ever the case with regard to tithes. Not one in a hundred of the English Members of the House would ever have remembered that such an announcement had been made. In regard to the Education Bill an announcement was made in the early days of the Government, when they had the world before them, and a majority of 150 behind them, but although the Prime Minister and the Leader of the House pledged themselves to that Bill it was never carried into law. It was now maintained that because in the fifth year of the existence of the Government, when they were beginning to become decrepit with age, the Chief Secretary announced that a certain Bill would be introduced, every purchaser of land in Ireland was solemnly warned of the intention of the Government and increased his price. A more grotesque or flimsy argument had never been placed before the House of Commons in support of or in opposition to any Amendment. He was not supporting this proposal because it was one directed against the landlords. As a matter of fact, it would hit more tenant proprietors than landlords, but he supported it because he believed it was fair and reasonable. The right hon. Gentleman was exhibiting the same unreasonable, irrational, and cantankerous spirit that he had shown throughout the whole course of the debates. On a previous occasion it was said there had been an honourable understanding arrived at that the Committee stage should be obtained on a certain evening, and that he had been guilty of a breach of that understanding. That was not the fact, because at the time he pointed out that the hon. and learned Member for North Louth spoke only for himself, and that so far as he (Mr. Dillon) and his friends were concerned, the date would depend a great deal on the attitude taken up by the Government in regard to concessions. No concessions were made, and the debates were therefore prolonged. They were now being met in exactly the same spirit, and it was evident that no Amendment whatever coming from the Irish benches was to be accepted.

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 140; Noes, 96. (Division List No. 222.)

AYES.

Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Right Hon. John
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r.
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Barry Rt Hn. A H Smith-(Hants
Bartley, George C. T.
Beach, Rt. Hon. Sir M H (Bristol
Bill, Charles
Blakiston-Houston, John
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Brassey, Albert
Bullard, Sir Henry
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derby.)
Cecil, Evelyn (Hertford, East)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.)
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles R.
Cook, Fred. Lucas (Lambeth)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cornwallis, Fiennes Stanley W.
Cox, Irwin Edw. Bainbridge
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton
Curzon, Viscount
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Donkin, Richard Sim
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Douglas-Pennant, Hon. E. S.
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Flower, Ernest
Foster, Colonel (Lancaster)
Fry, Lewis
Garfit, William
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Goldsworthy, Major-General
Gordon, Hon. John Edward
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, George J. (Sussex)
Greene, H. D. (Shrewsbury)
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Gull, Sir Cameron
Hamilton, Rt Hon. Lord George
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Henderson, Alexander
Hoare, Sir Samuel (Norwich)
Hobhouse, Henry
Houston, R. P.
Hutton, John (Yorks. N.R.)
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Lawrence, Sir E Durning-(Corn
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks)
Lecky, Rt. Hon. William Edw H
Leighton, Stanley
Llewelyn, Sir Dillwyn- (Swan.)
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowles, John
Macartney, W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
Manners, Lord Edward W. J.
Mellor, Colonel (Lancashire)
Melville, Beresford Valentine

Monckton, Edward Philip
Morgan, Hn. Fred. (Monmthsh.
Morrison, Walter
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford
Mount, William George
Muntz, Philip A.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Niniau
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Peel, Hon. Wm. Robert W.
Phillpotts, Captain Arthur
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Pollock, Harry Frederick
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, Rt. Hon. Sir M. W.
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Round, James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Russell, Gen. F. S. (Cheltenham
Russell, T. W. (Tyrone)
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. E. J.
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sidebotham, J. W. (Cheshire)
Sidebottom, William (Derbys.)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Christchurch)
Smith, J. Parker (Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spencer, Ernest
Stanley, Edward Jas (Somerset)
Stephens, Henry Charles
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strauss, Arthur
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Welby, Lt.-Cl. A. C. E. (Taunt'n)
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Wharton, Rt. Hn. John Lloyd
Williams, J. Powell- (Birm.)
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, George
Wyvill, Marmaduke D'Arcy

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Sir William Walrond and
Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Allan, William (Gateshead)
Allison, Robert Andrew
Ambrose, Robert
Atherley-Jones, L.
Austin, M. (Limerick, W.)
Barlow, John Emmott
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Augustine
Blake, Edward
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Carvill, Patrick G. Hamilton
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Commins, Andrew
Crean, Eugene
Crilly, Daniel
Curran, Thomas (Sligo, S.)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dillon, John
Doogan, P. C.
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eversheld, Sydney
Fenwick, Charles
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fox, Dr. Joseph Francis
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gourley, Sir Edw. Temperley
Griffith, Ellis J.
Harwood, George
Hazell, Walter
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Hogan, James Francis
Holland, William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, W. (Carnarvonshire)
Kay-Shuttleworth, Rt Hn Sir U
Lawson, Sir W. (Cumb'land)
Lewis, John Herbert
Macaleese, Daniel
MacDonnell, Dr. MA (Q'n's C.)
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Dermott, Patrick
M'Ghee, Richard
M'Leod, John
Maddison, Fred.
Mellor, Rt. Hn. J. W. (Yorks.)
Mendl, Sigismund Ferdinand
Molloy, Bernard Charles
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Connor, Arthur (Donegal)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Kelly, James
O'Malley, William
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Power, Patrick Joseph
Provand, Andrew Dryburgh
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Samuel, J. (Stockton on Tees)
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick, B.)
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)
Sullivan, T. D. (Donegal, W.)
Tanner, Charles Kearns
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Wason, Eugene
Wedderburn, Sir William
Williams, J. Carvell- (Notts.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, John (Govan)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES.—
Captain Donelan and Mr.
Patrick O'Brien.

Clause, as amended, added.

Schedule:—

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 8, to leave out from beginning of line to end of schedule."—(*Mr. G. W. Balfour.*)

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee) asked the right hon. Gentleman to explain why it was proposed to leave out these words. He wished the Committee to understand that this appeal which it was now proposed to exclude was identically the same in substance as the appeal in Clause 4. He put it to the Attorney General in Committee whether the effect of Clause 4 was not to repeal the whole of Section 7, except in regard to the definition of the word "owner," which it was necessary to retain. He understood the Attorney General to accept that view as being correct. If that was so, what they did in the schedule was exactly what he suggested would be the effect of the original clause in the Bill. If there was to be any choice he thought the words of the schedule were the best.

MR. ATKINSON replied that this was simply a consequential Amendment

rendered necessary by the introduction of the new clause.

Amendment agreed to.

Schedule, as amended, agreed to.

Bill reported; as amended, considered.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

*Mr. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.): The English and Scottish Members of the House have been content for the most part to leave the discussion of the details of this measure to hon. Gentlemen who come from the other side of St. George's Channel; and if the Bill were confined in most of its provisions to the question of lay tithe, mischievous as I believe them to be in principle and indefensible in method, I for one should have been satisfied with recording a silent vote against the third reading. Lay tithe always has been, and is still, a variable quantity. It is for the most part, at any rate, a payment made by one set of private persons to another; and any scheme of readjustment is a matter in which the taxpayers of Great Britain have very little direct concern. But when we come to the provisions of the Bill which deal with the ecclesiastical tithe they present a totally different aspect. The admitted effect—and I take my stand on the statements made by the Chief Secretary himself—of the provisions of this Bill, in so far as ecclesiastical tithe is concerned, is that they will involve a considerable immediate and a much larger prospective encroachment on the fund of the Irish Church; a fund created by the Legislature, for the administration of which it cannot divest itself of responsibility, which was solemnly dedicated by Parliament to the relief of unavoidable calamity and suffering in Ireland, and which is at this moment the only security for very large advances made at the risk of the Imperial taxpayer out of the Imperial Exchequer. I am, therefore, under no necessity to apologise—although this seems at first sight a purely Irish question—for asking the attention of the House for a few moments to this aspect of the Bill. The Irish Church Fund will be invaded, and will be curtailed in two distinct ways if this measure passes into law. I apologise for repeating propositions which have been so frequently put to the House in the course of this debate. In the first place, where tithe rent-charge has been in effect redeemed, the Bill proposes to reduce the number of years during which the purchase annuity has to run from fifty-two to forty-five years, or in other words, by something like one-seventh, with the acknowledged consequence that after a certain lapse of time there will be a loss to the capital value of the Church Fund approaching 1½ million. This fact has been admitted by the Chief Secretary himself. How was the term of fifty-two years, for which it is now proposed to substitute forty-five years originally fixed? It was fixed by the Irish Church Act of 1869, and when the proposal was made by Mr. Gladstone that the Irish tithe-payer—which, of course, means practically the Irish landlord—should be allowed to redeem this perpetual annual charge by an annuity spread over fifty-two years, it was indignantly denounced, and by no one with more vehemence than by the present Chancellor of the Exchequer, not because it imposed an undue burden upon the Irish landlord, but, on the contrary, because it involved a scandalous injustice to the Irish Church. It was said by the right hon. Gentleman that it was a unique combination of sacrilege and bribery—sacrilege, because it proposed to divert an ecclesiastical fund to the relief of the Irish landlords; bribery, because it proposed by that act of sacrilege to conciliate and buy off the opposition of the landlords to the disestablishment of the Church. Three years later, in 1872, when there had been the amplest opportunity for all parties concerned to consider the position, and if need be, revise it, the arrangement of 1869 with regard to the redemption of tithe, and the number of years over which the annuity was to be spread, was deliberately renewed by Parliament. And now, after the lapse of more than thirty years, when the land has changed hands over and over again, when those who were responsible as public trustees for the administration of the Church Fund had the best right to believe that they had a permanent basis of settlement, Parliament is asked to set the bargain aside. And upon what plea? Upon the most unsubstantial and illusory plea I have ever heard advanced in a serious discussion—namely, that not only the

arties immediately concerned, the land-rds on the one side and the representa-ves of the Church on the other, but the xecutive Government of the day and the wo Houses of Parliament were, first in 869 and again in 1872, the victims of a erical blunder. I should very much ke to know what would have been said , instead of the proposal being to reduce he term of fifty-two years to forty-five ears, it was, in consequence of some hange in the rate of interest and the alue of money, to raise the term from fty-two years to fifty-nine years. Hon. Members opposite would have come down o the House clothed in the panoply f landlord logic, and declared that a more iniquitous interference with the rights of property and sanctity of contract had never been suggested, and the very foundations of the House would have been rocked by the storm of indignation which the proposal would have aroused. I pass from that feature in this measure to the second branch, that is the proposal for dealing with the ecclesiastical tithe rent-charge. More mischievous in principle, and certainly not less injurious in the result, is this second proposal—the project to make the annual payment of ecclesiastical tithe vary according to the scale of judicial rents. I must point out to the House the fact that prior to 1872 ecclesiastical tithe, like lay tithe, was a variable quantity; but in 1872 ecclesiastical tithe was by the deliberate act of Parliament transformed into a fixed annual payment. Am I to be told that that was not a bargain? I gather from some statements which fell from the Chief Secretary that he is prepared to dispute that proposition on the extraordinary and, indeed, unintelligible ground that there was hardly any debate on the Bill of 1872 during its pasage through Parliament. I say, on the contrary, that in the fact that this proposal, completely transforming the character of ecclesiastical tithe, passed in comparative silence through both Houses, you have the best possible evidence that the two parties concerned—the trustees of the Church Fund on the one hand and the tithe-payers on the other—had by negotiations come to an agreement which they proposed should be ratified in the form of a solemn statute. And there was good reason why both sides should have arrived at such an arrangement. On the one side the administrators of the Church Fund may have thought it was an enormous advantage to them to have a fixed income which they could forecast five or six years in advance, instead of an income which was always fluctuating according to the prices of agricultural produce. On the other hand, the landlords had an equally good reason for entering into the bargain, for the prices of agricultural produce had been rising, and continued to rise for four or five years after 1872, and there was every reason to expect that the prices would go on rising. Therefore a fixed charge on the land would be more favourable to them than a varying tithe. Whatever were the reasons which influenced the minds of the two parties to this arrangement, the arrangement was made with the sanction of Parliament, and it has lasted for thirty years, and has regulated ever since the transactions of all persons interested in Irish land. Why is it to be ripped up? What is the emergency? What the justification for rescinding after an interval of twenty-eight years a solemn statutory compact? The Government are well advised in not defending the proposal on the ground of the fall in prices. For the possible rise on the one hand and the possible fall on the other of agricultural prices are the very contingencies to guard against which this statutory arrangement was entered into. Supposing, instead of the price of wheat and oats, which are the two staple products according to which the tithe rent-charge varied, having fallen, prices had continuously risen and the Government had now proposed to tear up the bargain of 1872 on the ground that it had proved injurious to the Irish Church Fund, what would have been the indignation of the landlords! In truth this proposal to relieve the Irish tithe-payer of the sum which he had contracted to pay is but the culmination and the climax of a series of measures, for which this Parliament is responsible, for the subvention and relief of particular classes and interests at the expense of the community at large. The series began in 1896, when the English and Scotch landlords were relieved of half their rates. It continued in 1897, when a large bounty was given to denominational schools to enable them to compete in the race with the Board schools. It was further developed in 1898 when the Irish landlords, in order to buy their assent, which is not to be had for

nothing, to a scheme for the establishment of local government in Ireland, which Lord Salisbury had prophetically denounced as even worse than Home Rule, were relieved of their one-half of the poor rate. In 1899—these things occur under the present dispensation with the monotonous regularity of the seasons—there was the proposal to relieve the ecclesiastical tithe receivers in England. Now, in 1900, lest any session of this Parliament should be left undistinguished by one of these enterprises in which a particular interest is championed by the Executive Government and by the Parliamentary majority of the day as against the community at large, we have the proposal to relieve the Irish tithe-payer. Yes, but this Bill, although it has, in common with its predecessors, the common characteristic of relieving one class at the expense of the whole, has one development on which I must congratulate the Government—a peculiar feature of its own. Hitherto in 1896, 1898, and 1899, when you have been granting these doles and endowments to particular classes—listening to the cries of the unfortunate or rather satisfying the clamours of the importunate—you have, in relieving your privileged class of the burden which it previously had to bear, made good to the fund depleted the loss which it would have sustained. You have made it good out of the Imperial taxation to the local rates. Far be it from me to suggest that the deficiency that is going to be created in the Irish Church Fund by the operation of this Bill should be met by Imperial taxation. That is not my proposition. I denounce the whole thing as an injustice, and as absolutely unnecessary and inexcusable. But the fact remains that this is the first occasion that the State has come and said as between two persons, the one of whom was a debtor and the other a creditor, the one bound to pay to the other by agreement and by statute in perpetuity £100 a year—has come and said to the debtor, "How much owest thou?" "A hundred pounds." "Write down £75." And that without a halfpenny of compensation, remember, to the creditor, whose income for all time to come is reduced by 25 per cent. At any rate, that proposal may have, and I think ought to have, one result—it ought to clear not only our minds but our debates of the cant—for cant it has become—about the inviolate sacredness of property and contract. I venture to warn hon. Gentlemen who sit on that side of the House, and who are going to vote for the Third Reading of this Bill, that they are estopped by the Vote that they are going to give to-night from ever protesting again on the ground of principle against any invasion on the part of the Legislature of proprietary rights. I do not know myself any clearer case of what the Romans used to call *novæ tabulæ* in the whole history of confiscation. How has that come about? One of my hon. friends, I think the hon. Member for the Border Burghs, in the debate on the Second Reading of this Bill, pointed out that there had not been a single argument used in support of this measure—in support, that is to say, of the diminution of the statutory payment chargeable to the tithe-payers in this case—that could not be used with equal force in favour of cutting down both the interest and principal of mortgages. What is the difference in point of principle between the claim of a mortgagee in the case of a private contract, and the claim of the Irish Church Fund in this case? There is no difference in point of principle, but there is a great difference in point of fact. Who are the parties to this bargain? On the one side you have the Irish landlords, an articulate and organised party, a class which, as we know by recent experience, is capable of inflicting on the Government the luxury of an annual defeat in the House of Lords. That is a peculiar prerogative of theirs which is not possessed by any other class. On the other hand, we have a public fund which has no organ of expression, of self-defence, of resistance, except the right hon. Gentlemen who sit upon the bench, and who are by the law and constitution of this country its appointed custodians and trustees. An hon. friend reminds me that as lately as last year, for this Bill was introduced last year and then withdrawn, owing to what is called the exigencies of Parliamentary business, a very prominent representative of the Irish landlords (the Duke of Abercorn) said in another place, "Why should this Government, the strongest in our time, not only in ability, but in votes, not support their friends who support them?" That was asked last year when this Bill was withdrawn; it is not going to be withdrawn this year, and those who support the Government are at last to

be supported. I pass to what I consider to be the crowning absurdity and injustice of this Bill. That is the proposal that in the future the tithe rent-charge is to vary according to the scale of the judicial rent. I should have thought that such a proposition as that would hardly admit of argument at all. Let the House consider for a moment what it means. This matter is going to be arranged county by county. You are not going to make an average of the reduced rents over Ireland as a whole; you are going to deal with it piecemeal, and the amount by which the landlord's contribution as a tithepayer to the Irish Church Fund is to be reduced is to correspond with the amount by which the judicial rents in his county have been reduced. The result is that wherever the reduction in the judicial rent has been greatest the reduction of the tithe rent-charge is greatest. Therefore it is exactly in those places where, in the judgment of the Land Courts, the landlords have exacted rents which did not equitably or morally belong to them, but were based on tenants' improvements, that the greatest relief is given. There is one circumstance connected with the selection of this particular standard of judicial reduction—what I will call the standard of confiscation—which I think the House ought to bear in mind, because I believe it explains the whole of this Bill. The only ground upon which the Bill can be logically based is that it is an instalment of compensation to the landlords for the reduction of rents which have been made under Act of Parliament. I cannot myself see any other ground on which the fall in judicial rents should henceforth be treated as the basis on which tithe rent-charge should be reduced. I will refer hon. Gentlemen opposite, and particularly right hon. Gentlemen, to a speech of the Duke of Devonshire the other day. He pointed out that the actual economic fall in rents measured by experience in this country is as great as, and in many cases far greater than, the compulsory reductions which have been made by the land tribunals in Ireland. He might also have pointed out—his audience was particularly appropriate for the purpose—that so far as these excessive rents, which have been reduced by the operation of the law, were based upon the appropriation by a landlord of the value put by a tenant, through his industry and capital, into the land, they were morally and politically indefensible. And, further, I will venture to say that the reduced rents now paid by the tenants and received by the landlord ought to be regarded as salvage from the social and economic wreck to which the landlords themselves have largely contributed. The rents which were charged prior to 1881, which appear in the contracts of tenants and which the landlords had a legal right to exact, were rents far in advance of what was the economic rent. What is more to the purpose is—and I again quote the authority of the Duke of Devonshire—they were rents which, in the then social condition of Ireland, not the whole force of the Empire of Great Britain could have made effectively recoverable from the tenants of Ireland, because the moral sense of the community of Great Britain would not have allowed you to use it. In so far, then, as this Bill is an attempt—I can find no other logical justification for it—to compensate the landlords of Ireland indirectly for the reductions which they have had to sustain in their rents, it ought to be repudiated by this House. I say it is a Bill which offends equally against the rules of common justice and sound finance. It tears up a statutory contract without adequate reason and without any compensation. It impairs, not only by what it does, but still more by the example it sets, the security of the Irish Church Fund. It introduces as the basis and standard of variation in tithe the fall in judicial rents, which is either wholly irrelevant or illogical. On these grounds the Bill is deserving of the condemnation of Parliament, and I beg to move that it be read a third time upon this day three months.

Amendment proposed,

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.' "—(*Mr. Asquith.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the question."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I confess that when the right hon. Gentleman rose to take part in the debate for the first time I was somewhat at a loss to conceive the reasons which induced him, at the eleventh hour, to intervene in this particular controversy. I am now no longer in doubt, and I think I can explain it before I sit down. The right hon. Gentleman, in the closing third of his speech, devoted himself to an attack on the Irish

landlords, whom he declared to be the spoilt darlings of the Government, and in whose favour we were prepared to ask the House to committ a gross injustice upon a public fund. I do not know that the occupants of this Bench or the Chief Secretary have any special reason to be grateful for the attentions which the Irish landlords have showered upon us. For my own part, I am the last person to criticise utterances which may well be put on one side. But I regret that the right hon. Gentleman should have thought it worth while to make an impassioned and elaborate attack upon a class who are not very popular either in this country or in the other, in numbers not very great, in political influence not very great, but who at the hands of Parliament in times past have been subjected to a kind of legislation on which I am not going to comment now, but which certainly has no parallel in the legislation of any civilised country. In his attack on the landlords the right hon. Gentleman has not scrupled to insinuate, even to assert, that the reduction of their rents by the Land Courts is the measure of the spoliation which they have inflicted upon their tenants, a scandulous and outrageous attack which was refuted by the right hon. Gentleman himself in the latter part of his speech, for he quoted, with enthusiastic approval by his supporters, a statement made by the Duke of Devonshire in another place that, after all, although the reductions of rent in Ireland had been considerable, they were not more considerable, but even less, than the reductions of rent which have taken place in England. Are the reductions of rent in England the measure of the spoliation inflicted by the English landlords on English tenants? No, Sir, they are the consequence of a fact, so notorious that I need not bring it to the attention of the House—the extreme, unforeseen, and unprecedented fall in agricultural value; and when the right hon. Gentleman roundly accuses the Irish landlords of having put all the difference between their present and former rents upon the improvements of the tenant, he might have remembered that the fall of agricultural prices, which has so afflicted the landed interest in England and Scotland, had not been absent in Ireland; and, mark this, the part of Ireland where rents have fallen, perhaps in greater degree than in any other part of Ireland, is that where the tenants' improvements were protected before the legislation of 1872 and 1881. It is in Ulster, where the tenants' improvements are protected by the Ulster custom, and adequately protected by the Ulster custom, that the fall in rents has been greater than in any other part of Ireland. Then, says the right hon. Gentleman, this is an act of spoliation so great, so flagrant and shameless, that no Gentleman who votes for the Third Reading of the Bill can ever again resist any act of spoliation passed upon a class or public funds. He compared it with the arbitrary diminution by Parliament of the interest upon mortgages. What resemblance is there between mortgage and tithe rent-charge? Mortgage never was a variable quantity. Historically, by general tradition, and universally accepted within a small compass of years, tithe has been a variable quantity, and why this House, dealing with a fund varying in its aspects, should not make its variations dependent on a rational plan, instead of on an arbitrary system, passes my belief. What is the right hon. Gentleman's desire? I suppose he thinks it would be fair to have variations determined by the price of wheat and barley and oats. Could anything be more absurd than fixing the variations of tithe in proportion to a crop which is hardly grown in Ireland at all? Over large districts it is wheat, and wheat alone, which determines the variations of the tithe rent-charge. That is the right hon. Gentleman's idea of equity, justice, and fairness. That is not all I have got to say against the right hon. Gentleman's accusation of spoliation. Has he ever heard of the alteration made in the annuities bought by the purchasers of glebe in Ireland? Those annuities were part of the assets of the Church Fund. They were bought directly under Parliamentary statutory contract by the glebe purchasers from the Church Fund. In 1885, Parliament, taking into account the great fall in the price of produce, consequently in the price of land, had mercy upon these glebe purchasers and diminished the amount of the interest on the annuities—in other words, reduced the assets of the Church Fund in favour of the glebe purchasers. Was that described as a dole? Was that described as a corrupt bargain? Was that described as a payment to a class? It was done by the common assent

of this House, with the assent of the hon. Gentlemen opposite and of the hon. Gentlemen from Ireland, not then so solicitous about the Church Fund as they appear to be now. And all this fine rhetoric which is now lavished when you are dealing with landlords was not heard of when you were dealing with tenants, and all these strong epithets were reserved for a more favourable and more popular opportunity. The truth is that the motive of the right hon. Gentleman's speech was sufficiently apparent when he gave his brief historic survey of what he called the annual dole which this Government gives to their supporters. [Opposition cheers.] I thought so. It is no particular love for the Church Fund, it is no burning anxiety to support hon. Gentlemen below the gangway, that has produced this unlooked for intervention of the right hon. Gentleman. He has taken occasion to make a speech, which, perhaps, he supposes may be an electioneering speech. He has travelled far outside the four corners of this Bill to excite prejudice on questions not even in the remotest manner connected with this Bill. I am not going to argue, I would be out of order to argue, about the amount of money given to rates in connection with the Local Government Bill for Ireland, or the half rates to farmers in England and Scotland, or the grant to Voluntary schools. But one word I think I may say on these three topics. I remember perfectly well when the first sketch of the Irish Local Government Bill was made in this House—because it so happened I was the person on whom the duty devolved to make it—an essential part of that scheme was to get rid of the natural, I venture to say just, or at all events the justifiable, objections which were naturally felt at so great a transfer of power from one class to another in Ireland, where, unhappily, divisions between parties had been so long and so bitter. How was that proposal met? Did we hear anything from the right hon. Gentleman and his friends about doles on that occasion? Not a word. I remember that that proposal, which was an integral part of that Bill, was met with a chorus of approval not alone from Members on this side of the House, but from gentlemen representing Ireland on that side of the House, and from their colleagues representing English constituencies.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR: It was the bribe we had to pay for Irish local government.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not agree with the hon. Gentleman; but let me take him on his own terms. Is it fair to swallow a bribe and then express disapproval when you get what you want by it? So much for the dole connected with local government in Ireland. Now I come to the half rates, which the right hon. Gentleman says we gave to the landlords in England. We gave them to the farmers. [HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!] Well, I am going to put a simple query to Members for agricultural constituencies in England sitting opposite. When they go down to their constituencies, and when they issue their addresses, is this dole to the farmers of England going to be represented as a monstrous abuse, and is there going to be any proposal that it should be repealed by the next Parliament? I shall be curious to have an answer to that question. I come now to the third dole, and that is the extra grant to the Voluntary schools. In that dole every single gentleman from Ireland supported the Government, and every single gentleman from Ireland voted against the Opposition. They were all for a policy of doles and subventions. Again I ask, are you going to the country to ask the country whether they are going to take away from the Voluntary schools the dole that has been given to them? And are you going to have the support of the Irish Members when the time for this inevitable policy arrives? It is all nonsense. The whole of this flimsy attack can be torn to pieces in a moment, and I am sorry that the right hon. Gentleman, plunging into a controversy with which I venture to say he is very little acquainted—[HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!]—judging from his speech, I think he is not intimately acquainted with the details, and that will come out before this debate concludes—I regret that the right hon. Gentleman should have dragged these matters into a debate which is important because it is controversial, but which has really nothing to do with the issue he has tried to raise, with the irritation he has tried to stir up, or the passions he has endeavoured to inflame, and which might have been left now, as on the earlier stages of this Bill, to be debated between the representatives of the

Irish Government in this House and the representatives of Ireland.

MR. DILLON: I think the tone of the speech of the right hon. Gentleman proves, if proof were needed, more than anything we have listened to in the course of this debate, the badness of the case of the Government. When the right hon. Gentleman denounced the right hon. Member for East Fife for intervening in this debate, he seems to have an extraordinary idea of the position of Irish Members in this House. As I have pointed out on previous occasions, we would always be glad if all English Members refrained from debate or division on Irish Bills or questions; but I protest against the doctrine that if the intervention of the Chief Secretary for Ireland who is not an Irish Member is to be accepted, we are to be denied assistance of hon. Members on this side of the House who are not Irish Members, but who choose to take up the cause of Ireland. I must say I am exceedingly grateful to the right hon. Member for East Fife for his speech, which tore to pieces, I do not say the arguments for, but the provisions of the Bill, and exhibited in a most powerful way its true inwardness. The right hon. Gentleman has fallen back on an argument given before by the Chief Secretary in the course of the debate. He reminded the House of the case of the glebe purchasers, and endeavoured to draw a most absurd parallel between the reduction of the interest granted to them and the reduction of the interest proposed to be given to the tithe rent charge payers. The glebe purchasers, it is true, were forced to buy their holdings at a time when land was greatly inflated in value, and the reason why very moderate concessions were made to them was that they were poor men struggling to make a living upon the land. What bearing has this in the case of men whose tithe rent-charge is only a very small charge on the land? If we were to accept the logic of that argument we should be carried irresistibly to the conclusion that because in Ireland there had been reduction of rents to occupiers effected by a process of law, therefore you are bound to reduce every charge on the land—quit rents, Crown rents, and mortgages. I say that the argument of the right hon. Gentleman absolutely disappears on that ground. The Members in charge of this Bill have been extremely free and ready to hurl charges against the gross ignorance of those who oppose it. If any English or Scotch Member intervenes he is said to be grossly ignorant; but the right hon. Member for East Fife exhibited, in my opinion, great intelligence in discussing the Bill, and certainly in point of capacity and knowledge of the law he compares favourably with the Attorney General for Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman got up, and from the box at the Table announced with vehemence that the rents had been reduced most in the province where the improvements of the tenants were protected by the Ulster custom. I should like to hear the opinions of the Ulster tenants on that point. Were the rents in Ulster and the improvements of the tenants protected by the custom before the Land Act was passed? Why, the custom gave no protection to tenants' improvements in Ulster, and that was the great reason why the Act of 1881 was passed. It was because the tenants in Ulster were pouring into the Land League, and the Government were frightened by the fact. If the improvements had been protected by custom, why did the Ulster tenants come into the Land League? I will tell the right hon. Gentleman one of the reasons, if he does not know it already, why the rents in Ulster had been reduced much more than in the South. It was because the tenants in Ulster, encouraged by the custom, and led to hope that they would have a saleable interest in the land, did make more improvements than the tenants in the South, and consequently their rents had been much more reduced. It is the fact, and the statement of the right hon. the Member for East Fife stands absolutely unanswerable, and cannot be controverted, that this Bill, in addition to all its other vices—God knows it has vices enough—actually proposes to put a premium on the bad landlords by graduating the amount of remission of tithe rent-charge in proportion to their badness. I know estates where there never has been a judicial rent fixed at all; and why? Because the landlords have been humane men, and met the circumstances of the time by reasonable remissions of rent. Now, supposing you could imagine—it is perfectly conceivable and legitimate to make the supposition—that there was

a county in Ireland in which all the landlords were good, reasonable men, and where no judicial rents had been fixed at all, what would this Bill do? It would give a reduction of 35 per cent. in the tithe rent-charge in a neighbouring county where all the landlords were rack-renters, and not a penny of reduction in the county where the landlords were good, reasonable men. Could anyone imagine a wilder extremity of absurdity? But there is another absurdity underlying the vicious economic principle involved in the standard of variation introduced into this Bill. The tithes were originally one-tenth of the gross produce of the land. They never had, throughout all their history, so far as I have any knowledge of the question of tithes, any relation to the cost of production, or subsequently to the rent. By the Act of 1838, in consideration of the substitution of a rent-charge leviable from the landlord in place of a tenth of the produce, and of its becoming a prior lien on the land, the tithe-owners consented to an enormous reduction in the value of their tithe, amounting in some cases to 60 or 70 per cent. All this is to be taken into consideration in estimating the nature of the ecclesiastical tithe rent-charge. From 1838 to 1872 it was variable, but since 1872 it was invariable and a first charge on the land, having priority over all other charges, except quit-rents. You are now introducing a totally new principle of variation according to rents. I maintain that the variation of rent ought not, and as a matter of fact does not, bear an exact proportion to the variation of the prices of agricultural produce. Suppose the prices of agricultural produce had remained stationary, and the cost of the production had increased, rents would have been bound to go down. On the Second Reading of this Bill I said that it was a proposal as regards the main part of its provisions to subsidise the Irish landlord, and I ventured to suggest that it would be much simpler, more honest, and sounder, from an Irish point of view, if the Government would make up their minds how much money they were going to distribute amongst the Irish landlords, and put it in the Bill, be it £1,500,000 or £2,000,000. That course, however, did not recommend itself to the Government. I venture to point out to the Chief Secretary that this system of bribery will produce no good result. You are now proposing to plunder the Church Fund, which was put aside by Parliament for the Irish public, for the sake of bribing the Irish landlords, and you are now reaping your reward. I was not surprised at a certain bitterness of tone in the speech of the First Lord of the Treasury. At a great Orange meeting held on the 12th July, Lord Erne, Grand Master of the Orange Society, denounced the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary as a pest and a nuisance, and declared that the brothers Balfour were the curse of Ireland. That is all the reward they get. These Orange gentlemen understand their proceedings perfectly well. They believe they have got this Bill by abuse, and the only result of the Government throwing their body to the wolves will be that the wolves will howl louder at their back than ever. One lamentable consideration which the House of Commons and the Government have got to hug to their bosoms is that, instead of getting any benefit whatever from any section by this pernicious Bill, it will be found that the Irish people are indignant, as they ought to be, and regard it as an act of spoliation; while the Irish landlords will denounce the brothers Balfour as the greatest pests which ever came to Ireland. After all the discussions on this Bill, I am only confirmed in the opinion that a more indefensible one was never introduced into this House. I desire to say a few words on a portion of the Bill which has been somewhat neglected in the course of the discussions—the portion which deals with those tithes which are private property. The discussions in Committee have, I think, fully justified the protest which I ventured to make on the Second Reading against the plan adopted by the Government of including in the Bill two subjects incompatible and unsuited to be dealt with in the same measure—one the payment made by the ecclesiastical tithe-payers to a public fund, and the other the payment made by the tithe lay impropriator; that is a payment made by one set of individuals to another, who are owners of what is really private property, just as much as Government stock is, and which, as a matter of fact, has been made a subject of sale in Ireland continually for over sixty years. Hardly a week passes that you do not see in Dublin newspapers advertisements of the sale of lay impro-

priate tithes as a portion of real estate. Now, these tithes have been variable according to certain standards, and by well ascertained methods; and for sixty-two years they have never been interfered with, nor has a suggestion ever been made to alter the standard of variation. About seven or eight years ago the Government made a blunder by discontinuing the publication in the *Dublin Gazette* of the tables of the average prices of wheat and oats as the necessary evidence of variation; and the result was that the lay impropriate tithes could not be varied for a period of seven years. But the Government might have recommended the republication of the average prices, and then, after seven years, these lay impropriate tithes might have been varied as they had been for sixty-two years. All that was necessary was to fill in this gap of seven years by a short Bill of one clause, according to the prices in the Reports of the Irish Land Commission. I cannot conceive why the Government did not concede that, except that they wanted a bit of oil or grease for other purposes. The Government, taking advantage of this excuse of a mistake in the publication of the Government *Gazette*, propose to alter the standard of variation which governs the relation of exclusive property between man and man. From whom has come a call for such a course of conduct? Has it come from the tithe-payers or the tithe-owners? The result of this arbitrary alteration of the standard of variation will be that some tithe-owners will be able to get a good deal more than they would under the old variations, and some will get a good deal less. I have never got an answer to the question, on what ground the Government have obtained the right to walk in between the owners of this private property and say, "Take this Bill for £50 and write it down £40"; or, "Take this Bill for £50 and write it up £60." What is the excuse or justification for that? I have here a very curious document in connection with this question. There is an association in Ireland of lay impropriate tithe-payers. I do not know whether the lay impropriate tithe-owners have an association. The lay impropriate tithe-payers claim that the average prices of agricultural produce should be published, and their legal right restored of having their payments regulated by these average prices. They held a meeting last spring to consider the proposals of the Government Bill of last year, which was exactly the same as the present Bill. In a speech at that meeting, made by Mr. Sandhurst, he said that they ought to appeal to the Government to introduce a Bill to remedy the great injustice complained of that they were not able to get their legal right of variation. And Mr. Sandhurst added that they did not consider that the Bill of last session met the case at all of the lay impropriate tithe-payers, nor could such a measure be accepted. The lay impropriate tithe-payers are not satisfied with this Bill, because it gives too much relief to some and not enough relief to others; in other words, because it arbitrarily alters the law without regard to justice. I assert positively that during my twenty years experience of the House of Commons no such proposal was ever made to interfere with the rights of property on any public or private ground. There was no necessity of any kind for it, except that the right hon. Gentleman said, when pressed, that it would make the law more symmetrical. That is a most favourable illustration of the spirit in which this Bill was drafted; and I think the Government have treated the House of Commons very unfairly in having mixed up the greater question of ecclesiastical tithes with this of purely private property, which might be dealt with by a Bill of one clause. Now, I turn for a moment to the proviso in Clause 1 by which the Church Fund is to lose £1,300,000. But before I say anything on the financial position of the Church Fund after this Bill passes into law, I desire to deal with the contention put forward two or three times, that the fifty-two years annuities were based upon a miscalculation. The right hon. Gentleman seemed, on the Second Reading, to venture to doubt whether we would question his contention that this fifty-two years was a miscalculation. In that he was most audacious. Remember that if we destroy the theory of this miscalculation, we destroy the only justification for the first sub-section of this clause, which involves a loss to the Church Fund of £1,300,000.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: £1,110,000.

MR. DILLON: How is the theory of miscalculation made out? In 1869, when Mr. Gladstone introduced the Church Bill

first, he proposed that it should be open to the payers of tithe rent-charge to buy their tithe rent-charge, either for cash, at twenty-two and a half years purchase, or to buy the gross tithe rent at twenty-two and a half years purchase, the Government lending them money on such terms that, by making an annual payment for forty-five years, principal and interest would be extinguished; and he stated that he calculated the annual payment would be 3½ per cent. of the gross tithe rent-charge. The original proposal was forty-five years instalments; but when the Bill came into Committee Mr. Gladstone himself moved an amendment to Clause 32, proposing to substitute fifty-two years instalments for forty-five years, and at the same time he agreed that the tithe rent-charge payers should have the right to deduct from their tithe rent-charge, before the price was calculated, the sum of the whole of the poor-rate, which was considerable. Again, he made a further concession. Whereas at the Second Reading of the Bill he proposed that the instalments should be at the rate of £4 10s. per cent. of the gross tithe rent-charge, in Committee he proposed that it should be £4 9s. per cent. per annum of the nett valuation, and that the instalments should be spread over fifty-two years. Now, that settlement was denounced by the present Chancellor of the Exchequer as sacrilegious bribery, and also by the chief Irish landlords. On a division, however, it was carried by the unanimous vote of the landlords in this House, despite the protest of the Chancellor of the Exchequer and Mr. Forster and the Radical party. Now the right hon. Gentleman has the audacity to get up and tell us that the whole of this transaction was based on an arithmetical miscalculation, a calculation which was first of all worked out by the English Treasury, adopted by Mr. Gladstone, and passed the test of prolonged discussion in this House. I admit that some exception was taken to it; but it was as being too favourable to the landlords. Neither Mr. Disraeli nor Mr. Gladstone nor the champions of the Irish landlords ever suggested the doctrine of miscalculation which is now advanced. Then a period of three years elapsed, and the whole question was re-surveyed in this House in 1872, and again the Irish landlords, who were largely represented in this House and in the House of Lords, never protested, and the Bill passed through the two Houses of Parliament without a single word of criticism on their part. Therefore up to the Act of 1872 there was no suggestion whatever of a miscalculation. From 1872 down to 1881 and from 1881 to 1890 the whole intelligence of the Irish landlords as well as of the innumerable skilful lawyers who are attached to them in Ireland was devoted to searching and rummaging through the land legislation passed by this House in order to find a grievance. Yet this miscalculation was never heard of. Are we to be told that the Irish landlords and the lawyers who are their friends in Ireland would not have discovered during these years this arithmetical mistake, and the greatest that would ever have appeared in history if it existed? In June, 1894, Lord Belmore in his famous question started this doctrine. What set the Irish landlords on this theory of miscalculation? They were set on it because it had come to their knowledge that a great loan on the Irish Church Fund was to be paid off, and that when it was paid off a certain sum would be set free, and it occurred to the Irish landlords that they ought to get hold of it. It was really for that reason, and for no other reason that I can discover, that they invented this doctrine of miscalculation. Lord Belmore put a series of questions in the House of Lords, in the course of which this doctrine was started. He asked why did the Treasury in 1869 recommend the Government of the day to alter the terminable annuities from forty-five years to fifty-two, and also whether there was not a miscalculation made as to the term of years in which the principal sums with interest would be paid off? That involved the doctrine that Mr. Gladstone and the Treasury of that day were not able to calculate in what number of years an annuity would pay off a principal sum with interest. Lord Belmore was informed in reply that there was no miscalculation because no rate of interest was prescribed in the Act. After the lapse of twenty-eight years the Treasury on the motion of Lord Belmore again examined the question, and laid it down that there was no basis for the charge of miscalculation, and yet in face of that fact and the other facts I have cited the right hon. Gentleman states that the case of the landlords is perfectly clear. This is what

the right hon. Gentleman said on the point—

"Objection to this provision of the Bill must therefore be made on either of two grounds: First, that a 3½ per cent. rate of interest is too low—which would be a bold assertion in the face of Mr. Gladstone's own statement, and of the fact that the rates of interest formerly paid by tenant purchasers of Church lands have all been reduced from 3½ per cent. to 3¼ per cent. Or, secondly, that it is just that a terminable annuity for the redemption of a capital sum should continue to be paid for seven years after such capital sum can be shown by the rules of arithmetic to have been repaid."

That is saying in so many words that Mr. Gladstone did not understand, and that for twenty-nine years the British Treasury were absolutely unable to grasp, the rules of arithmetic. That is a most extraordinary position for the right hon. Gentleman to take up, and yet it is the only ground on which he can justify this enormous drain on the Church Fund. I maintain after all these prolonged discussions that there is no shadow or shred of excuse for surrendering to the Irish landlords seven years instalments which they contracted to pay, and which in justice they ought to be compelled to pay as long as they retain their land. Let me turn for a few minutes to the effect of this Bill on the Church Fund, because that, after all, is a very important question, and one which we were not able to discuss fully in Committee. I thought we might have been able to obtain some more light on the matter. I have been endeavouring ever since the Bill of last year was introduced to obtain from the Government a really satisfactory calculation of what will be the effect of this Bill if passed into law on the Church Fund, and I have never been able to get anything but the most perfunctory and confusing answers. I think the Bill has been drawn in such a way that it is absolutely impossible to calculate with any degree of certainty what will be its effect on the Church Fund, and that alone would be a sufficient ground for rejecting it, because I cannot conceive any more vicious method of legislation than, as regards a complicated Bill affecting a great public fund, to be told by the minister in charge that it is really impossible to ascertain the effect of the Bill. This is the only statement vouchsafed to us during the discussions on this Bill by the right hon. Gentleman as to its effect on the fund. He said—

"I may say, generally, that the result of the calculations has been most carefully verified both by the Treasury and by the Land Commission; and I think we may take it that, as far as possible, accuracy has been obtained. At least, it is not for want of trouble taken by one side or the other. Now, the reduction of the period of the currency of the terminable annuities will have the effect of reducing the Church Fund by a capital sum of £1,140,000; but this loss will not begin until the year 1917, when the earliest terminable annuities run out. What effect are the proposals of the Bill likely to have on the resources of the Church Fund? By the first proposal, that fund will ultimately lose a capital sum of about £1,140,000, but this loss will not begin until the year 1917. The second proposal of the Bill will result in the immediate loss of an annual sum of about £33,000. This loss will continue for the first fifteen years, and may increase in subsequent periods of fifteen years with any additional average reduction of judicial rents. The abolition of the right to redeem the tithe rent-charge will result in a gain to the Church Fund of a capital sum, the exact amount of which it is impossible to state, but which may conceivably be £3,500,000. This gain, however, will not begin to accrue for forty-five years from the present time. [Mr. DILLON: Is that based on the supposition that no sales take place?] Yes, that is so. By the fourth proposal of the Bill there will be a gain to the Church Fund of an annual sum of £6,000."

We are told that if no land is sold in Ireland the Church Fund in forty-five years will gain three and a half millions, but land is now being sold in Ireland at the rate of about one and a half millions per annum, and there is a movement, which if I do not misunderstand it will result in transferring all the land of Ireland to the farmers certainly within the next twenty years, and probably within the next ten years. Therefore this calculation, on the strength of which we are to make this huge inroad into the Church Fund, is absolutely delusive. We are solemnly asked to look forward and to attach weight to a possible advantage to the Church Fund resulting from the abolition of the right to redeem, which will begin to accrue in forty-five years, and only begin if no sale of land takes place in the interval, whereas we all know that long before that period all the land of Ireland will be sold, and instead of three and a half millions I say that if the fund benefits to the extent of £200,000 it will be the outside figure possible. But the loss to the fund begins on the day on which this Bill becomes operative, and will continue and increase until the whole Church Fund will be dissipated. The

provision in the Act of 1896 could at least be plausibly defended, as it was inserted for the purpose of promoting the sale of land to the tenants. It might have been said, just as it was said when we swallowed the dole to the landlords in order to secure local government, that the landlords should be allowed to reap that advantage under the Act of 1896 as a reward for selling their land to their tenants, because everyone is anxious to get rid of this land quarrel, which has brought almost inconceivable evils on Ireland, and we are all prepared to make sacrifices to end it, on reasonable terms. Therefore when the clause in the Act of 1896 was introduced—although I am looked upon as irreconcilable in these matters, and I admit I am—I did not feel called upon to protest against it, just as I abstained from dividing against the Agricultural Grant in 1898, because although I did not approve of the principle, there was a great object to be gained, which I was willing should be gained, even at the cost of the Church Fund. But what do you propose to do by this Bill? You reverse that policy. You are now offering to the landlords who have refused to sell the same advantages and concessions as were given by the Act of 1896 to landlords who were willing to sell, and in that way also you are doing a great wrong. I think the First Lord of the Treasury was very ill-advised in throwing sneers across the House at the Irish Members who are working under very difficult circumstances to protect the interests of their constituents. He said it was very unfair of us to adopt the attitude we did adopt with regard to the Rating Act, and he said that we swallowed the bribe. We are obliged to endeavour to pass legislation for our own country in this House in circumstances of the most cruel difficulty, and we are obliged to submit to the conditions imposed on us by the strangers who rule us. We have never been able to discuss Irish matters on their merits in this House. You never deal with Irish measures on their merits. You deal with them either because of the disturbed condition of Ireland or because you wish a bribe to be distributed among a certain class in that country. When a measure of land reform or popular government is offered to us it is always tied up with some condition we strongly object to, but we are told that we must swallow the whole thing or get nothing. That is the principle we are compelled to accept, and I am not a bit ashamed of our accepting it under the circumstances. But I warn the First Lord of the Treasury and the Irish Secretary that the course they are pursuing on this Bill will gain them neither authority nor respect in Ireland. The Chief Secretary has been five years in office, and has made flourishing speeches about killing Home Rule by kindness.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: It has been said over and over again that I used the words "killing Home Rule by kindness." I should be very glad to have the report of that speech produced.

MR. DILLON: The phrase has been quoted by the right hon. Gentleman's supporters.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: I have had no opportunity of challenging the statement in the House before.

MR. DILLON: My recollection is that the right hon. Gentleman had been charged with the intention of killing Home Rule by kindness, and that he said he would be very glad if he succeeded in doing so. What I would advise him to pursue would be a policy not of kindness but of justice. I resented that speech as it was reported at the time, because I do resent, as I think I am entitled to resent, Englishmen or Scotchmen coming over to Ireland and adopting a tone of superiority and condescension which the Irish people do not appreciate. If the right hon. Gentleman pursues such a policy as that he will never win respect from any section of the population. What we want in Ireland is fair play and justice, and if the right hon. Gentleman would embark on a policy of fair play—I do not say he would kill Home Rule, because he would not—he would win the respect of all sections of the Irish people. But the policy of bribery, the policy which has dictated this Bill, will have the effect of exasperating the Irish people who agree with us, and of arousing only the contempt of the section represented by the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for North Armagh. The right hon. and gallant Gentleman, while the Government are engaged in passing this Bill, does not use the same language as he would use at an Orange

meeting in Ireland. The Chief Secretary has now learned after five years administration in Ireland, although he has distributed hundreds of thousands of pounds as largess among the Irish landlords, that all he has got is to be denounced as a second "Dick Turpin," and to be told that he and his brother are the greatest curses ever sent to Ireland.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I only desire to occupy the time of the House for a few minutes in referring to matters not hitherto mentioned in the debate. First, as to the manner in which this Bill has been introduced—there are only two names on the back of it, namely, the Attorney General for Ireland and the Chief Secretary. I maintain that that is a a public scandal in a public Bill. This Bill is eminently a financial measure. It deals with an enormous amount of money to be transferred from a public fund to a particular class in Ireland, and it is a gross public scandal that the Finance Minister should not be publicly responsible for it. The Finance Minister is Chancellor of the Exchequer not only for England but for Ireland, and it was his duty to have explained this Bill to the House. Then the other Finance Minister, the Secretary to the Treasury, has not in the least intervened in the debates. The names of the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Secretary to the Treasury have been on the back of all the other great financial measures referring to Ireland, because they dealt with public money. The name of the Chancellor of the Exchequer is absent from this Bill because he denounced its principle thirty years ago in language which has never been retracted. Probably the Secretary to the Treasury has also expressed his well-known opinions privately with reference to boodle of this kind. I say no Bill involving one and a half millions of money has ever been presented to this House except on the responsibility of the Finance Minister. Let me remind the House that the Irish patriot party insisted, when the Union was carried, on having an Irish Chancellor of the Exchequer to conduct Irish financial business in this House, and in the early years of this century the Irish Chancellor of the Exchequer was no less a person than Mr. Foster, who had been Speaker of the Irish House of Commons. If you had a majority, not of 140, but of 300 in this House, and an Irish Chancellor of the Exchequer to guard the Irish purse, a measure of this kind would be impossible. The Conservative Members have shown me great courtesy, and it is irritating to them when a discussion on the matter which they think threshed out is continued, but I would point out that Mr. Disraeli, on the Second Reading of the Irish Church Bill, denounced this arrangement which is now being carried in the interests of the Irish landlords. Sooner or later, Mr. Disraeli said, the Irish landlords would gourmandise all the Church Fund. He said that the whole property of the Church of Ireland, generally speaking, would go to the landlords. (Interruption.) Hon. Gentlemen might well buzz at the idea of it. Mr. Disraeli went on to say that for thirty years the Irish landlords had had £100,000 a year out of the Church property, amounting in all to probably £3,000,000, and he asked what good it had done. Was the state of Ireland improved by it? But Mr. Disraeli under-estimated the case. When the first avaricious raid was made on the property of the Church of which the landlords were members, the Ecclesiastical tithe charge was commuted at a tenth of its value, and 25 per cent. over and above was paid to them for collecting it. In 1867 the agricultural crops in Ireland were of the value of £30,000,000, but the amount of the tithe rent-charge was only put at £370,000; whereas it ought to have been £3,000,000, and the difference between £370,000 and £3,000,000 went into the pockets of that virtuous class, the Irish landlords. I say that the landlords have got far too much out of the Irish Church Fund already; but by this Bill they are getting by the reduction of the annual instalments from fifty-two to forty-five years, a sum equal to £1,500,000, although the Chief Secretary, who is generally wrong in his calculations, only made it out at £1,140,000. I object to the Irish landlords getting through a brutal and palpable fraud anything out of the Church Fund, which ought to be devoted to the Irish people when suffering from some unavoidable calamity. The Irish landlords never object to charity. Long after the Reformation, successive Acts of Parliament were passed to enable tenants to make a raid on the Church lands. The Duke of Abercorn and others

like him are tenants of the lands stolen from the Irish Church. The Irish Bishops, who were generally English importations——

*MR. SPEAKER: I fear the hon. Member is going to somewhat ancient history in reference to this Bill.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: The object of the Bill is ancient history, but I will not refer to the matter, Mr. Speaker, if you tell me not to do so. I will do whatever you tell me.

*MR. SPEAKER: As the hon. Member appeals to me, I would ask him not to continue his remarks on ancient Irish history.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: With great respect, I think that is rather an unfair advantage to take. You will do better if you will allow me to show that I was endeavouring to bring this ancient history into connection with this Bill. I am pleading that this Bill should not pass, and that the chief beneficiaries under this Bill have already got enormous slices of the Church land. The Duke of Abercorn——

*MR. SPEAKER: I think the hon. Member is really trifling with the House in going into this matter.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: If you do not permit me, I shall say no more; but If I am not permitted to speak of it in this House I shall be able to see that it is made well known in Ireland. The First Lord of the Treasury was scarcely right in saying that he was benefitting the Irish landlords in spite of themselves. He said, "We are only doing justice to the Irish landlords who are reviling us." He ought to have known that amongst the persons to whom he is doing this act of justice, and who will be most benefitted by it, are Members of the present Government and extensive Irish landlords. The benefit of this Bill to the ordinary poor Irish landlords, with a rental of £800 to £1,500 a year, is of small significance. But it is of enormous significance to these extensive Irish landlords. I will give the names of the members of the Government who will enormously benefit by the Bill—the Duke of Devonshire, Lord Lansdowne, Lord Londonderry, and the Earl of Pembroke. I will say, in conclusion, that I never recollect any Act which has been passed by a Ministry which will confer such pecuniary benefits on the members themselves, or certain of them, as this Act will. In fact, the whole thing is, I am sorry to say, a most atrocious and infamous fraud on a public fund—a fraud perpetrated on the poor in the interests of the rich. It is a perfect illustration of the proverb which warns not to rob the poor because they are poor. We have heard a great deal of the tithepayer, and of the equity which should attach to our dealings with him. But we have heard nothing of the titheowner, who is the person principally affected, because as the tithe rent-charge is reduced so surely is the tithe-owner affected. Why is that? It is because the titheowners are poor, and have no great political influence. On the whole I regard this Bill as, in the words of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, sacrilegious bribery. I am inclined, however, to rejoice at this Bill, because it destroys altogether the sanctity of contracts, and will make any attack on the public revenue or on private property utterly unassailable by gentlemen on these benches who have sanctioned this Bill.

MR. FLYNN: I complain of the attitude of the Treasury in regard to this Bill. One would have thought that the natural guardians of the Irish Church Fund, which is the only public fund which the Irish people have had since the Union, would have been the Chief Secretary and the Attorney General. But the hopes we have placed on them have been falsified. It is impossible but that there shall be loss on one fund or another; if not on the Church Fund it will fall on the Treasury, because nearly half of the liabilities of the Irish Church Fund have been guaranteed by the Treasury. On what ground did the Government bring in this Bill? They cannot put the saddle on two horses at once. Either the settlement of 1872 was wrong, and Mr. Gladstone and the Treasury of that date made an absolute mistake; and, as the Chief Secretary says, this Bill was introduced to correct that mistake;

or the Duke of Devonshire was right when he said in another place that the Bill had been introduced as a compensation to the Irish landlords for the reduction of their rents by the Land Act of 1881. It is not the least invidious feature of this Bill that members of the Government, including the noble Lord whose speech has been already referred to, and members of the Cabinet, will be among those who will get a large slice out of the Irish Church Fund. I presume, if there is any virtue in actuarial calculations, that if the Treasury were right in 1895 they ought to be right now, and if in 1895 the Irish Church Fund would not bear any further burden, how is it possible that the Fund can now be so solvent and so strong that it can have this one and a half million taken away from it as well as £33,000 a year, especially when it is considered that since 1895 £70,000 a year has also been taken from it for the Agricultural Board? The Treasury have been got at. In 1895 they opposed the proposal of the Land Commissioners to reduce the repayments of the debt to them on behalf of the Irish tenants from twenty-two and a half to twenty years. That was refused in connection with a large scheme of land purchase, to which both political parties were committed, and the Government opposed it on the ground that it would affect the Irish Church Fund. Meantime £70,000 a year has been taken from it for the Agricultural Board. We are told that that £70,000 is all right, and that if at the end of fifteen years this Department for improving agriculture and instructing our people cannot obtain that money, we might perhaps have a case to go to the Treasury. I should like to see the position of the Irish Minister who at the end of fifteen years would have to approach the Treasury and say that the Agriculture Department could not continue any longer. In conclusion I think we are justified in putting before the House, and I trust also before the country, that this Bill has not been demanded by any body of public opinion or by any important movement. It is a Bill brought in to satisfy a small but hungry section of the supporters of evictions in Ireland. It is a Bill which will give more to the rich landlord than to the small struggling landlord. To him that possesses much will be given more, whereas the poor landlords will be given very little, but whether this money be given to the rich and prosperous landlord in large measure, or to the small and struggling landlord in small measure, it comes from an Irish fund which does not belong to the Treasury, and which it is an act of tyranny on the part of English and Scotch Members to interfere with.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR: I feel it my duty, even at this advanced hour, to join in the final protest of my hon. friends against this Bill. It is certainly not our fault that the House has been put to the inconvenience of remaining up to this hour. The right hon. Gentleman insists on pushing the Bill through to-night, and that is the reason why Members have been put to the inconvenience of this prolonged sitting. The Leader of the Opposition, in the speech he made during these debates, described the Bill as the most extraordinary Bill of the century. I think that description was amply justified, and I think also that the Bill has been produced and carried through under very extraordinary circumstances. This is the sixth night on which we have dealt with this question, and there are much more urgent demands on the attention of Parliament. Only this afternoon the Leader of the House was asked on what date he would bring forward the Indian Budget. He was asked that question in view of an accumulation of suffering on the people of India which is unparalleled in history, and the right hon. Gentleman had to reply that he could just give one afternoon in the course of next week for discussing the fate and fortunes of 250 millions of people stricken by famine and plague and almost every other evil that can befall a nation. Again, 200 Members of this House asked for two or three hours to pass a Bill dealing with an important branch of the salvation of this country from the vice of drink, and that request was refused. A most important question, affecting the welfare of millions of people, has been refused discussion, while to an unjust measure like this Bill the Government have given six nights of most precious time. The Leader of the House made an impassioned reply to the speech of the late Home Secretary, and he made one observation in the course of that reply to which I will allude. The right hon. Gentleman laid down this proposition, which is

gratifying to me and most astonishing as coming from him, that he would be better pleased if the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fifeshire had allowed the debate to proceed on the lines on which it has hitherto been conducted, namely between the official representatives of the Irish Government and the Irish Members. He indignantly objected to the intervention of one of the ablest Members of this House in an Irish debate. That would have been permissible if it came from one who believed that Ireland should be governed by the Irish Members; but this indignant surprise at a British Member venturing to intervene between the official representatives of the Irish Government and the Irish Members came very strangely from one of the high priests of Unionism in this House. It is quite true that the debates on this Bill have been mainly left to the Chief Secretary and the Irish Members, not only as to the making of the speeches, but also as to the hearing of the speeches. We have conducted these debates with only the Chief Secretary and the Attorney General for Ireland on the Treasury Bench, and an occasional visit from the Leader of the House, and the Irish Members not in such large number as I should like, but still in considerable number on these benches. The benches opposite were as a rule deserted, or perhaps occupied by two or three phantoms—I use the word in a spiritual rather than a physical sense—who made more conspicuous the absence of the general body of the Conservative party. But when the division bells were rung these gentlemen who had not heard a single word of the speech, and who, I venture to say, would not pass the most primary examination as to the provisions of even the first clause of the Bill, trooped in from the terrace, the smoke rooms, and the library, and voted down the representatives of Ireland, not in accordance with the arguments, because they did not hear them, but at the direction of the Whips of their party. Therefore, when the First Lord of the Treasury objected to the intervention of the right hon. Member for East Fife, who made a most able and brilliant speech, I think he would have taken more logical ground if he had asked not only that the debates should be confined to the representatives of the Irish Government and the Irish Members, but that the voting should be confined to them also. I should like to call attention to the statement of the Leader of the House that a great reduction of rents had taken place in Ulster. That was an avowal I was very glad to hear. I do not know whether his knowledge of that fact was the result of these debates, but I think he happened to be in the House when we were dealing with that particular branch of the question. He followed that, however, with the astounding statement that in Ulster the tenants' improvements had always been protected by the Ulster custom. Did that statement come as a matter of surprise to the Chief Secretary? Does the right hon. Gentleman accept it?

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: Broadly speaking, yes.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR: Then I can only say that "broadly speaking" the ignorance of the right hon. Gentleman is almost as great as the ignorance of his brother. When the First Lord of the Treasury says that the tenants in Ulster were protected as to their improvements, I assume he means by the Ulster custom. But every Ulster man knows that the Ulster custom was confined to the right of free sale, and that right of free sale did not interfere with the right of the landlord to raise the rent on the incoming tenant in spite of the fact that the incoming tenant had paid for that right. The Ulster men were in a state of more aggravated revolt than any other part of Ireland. The First Lord accepted the fact—he could not deny it on the statistics presented to the House—that the highest reductions took place in the northern province; but what did that prove? It proved the hypocrisy of the cry of the landlords that the reduction of the rents was the production of political agitation and not of their own rack-rents in the north of Ireland. In the county of Armagh the reductions in the rent amounted to 28 per cent., and in the county of Down, the most loyal of all the counties, the reductions of rent made by private agreement reached the extraordinary figure of 40 per cent.; and it was in these very counties where rack-renting had been most triumphant. Yet it is in these counties that the largest amount of the bribe provided by this Bill will be given to the Irish landlords. I do not see the right hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh

in his place, but if he were here I would tell him that, instead of the landlords in these counties having a right of complaint against the Government, they have been the spoiled children and curled darlings of this Administration. The Irish landlords are the only class in this community who have been able to come to this House and get compensation for the reduction of their revenue brought about by economic and insurmountable causes. The Duke of Devonshire said some time ago that he had to submit to a 16 per cent. reduction of rent on his estates in Ireland, while, on a similar estate in Somerset, the reduction had been 35 per cent. But the difference between them is this: that for the reduction on his English estate he got no compensation whatever, always excepting the Agricultural Rating Act. And he dare not come to ask this House, because his rent had been reduced 35 per cent., to make it up to him. Even if he went to the House where he sits, which is the guardian on the social and political interests of the landlords, and said, "I want compensation because my rents in Somerset have been reduced 35 per cent.," he would be laughed to scorn. But when the loss is 16 per cent. in Ireland, that changes his character from an English to an Irish landlord; and he goes to the Chief Secretary for Ireland, who says to him, "My poor gilded pauper, I really must come to your relief, because you have had 16 per cent. taken off your rents." And the right hon. Gentleman forthwith proceeds to bring in the Local Government Bill for Ireland, and because their Graces have been gracious enough to extend to Ireland the local liberties given by consent of all parties in England and Wales and Scotland, and which must therefore have come inevitably to Ireland by the logic of events, his Grace and the class to which he belongs are immediately relieved of practically all contribution to the local expenses of Ireland. But, not satisfied with that dole, they go to the right hon. Gentleman two or three sessions afterwards and demand that because their rents have been reduced 16 per cent.—half the reduction in England—they want more compensation. And the Chief Secretary, addressing these poor gilded paupers, says, "Let me see, what fund is there which we can draw upon in order to put another dole into their pockets?" And the right hon. Gentleman takes the unprotected Church Fund, makes a dive at it, and gives out of it practically two millions of money to the landlords of Ireland, who had had their rents reduced 16 per cent., instead of 35 per cent. in England. The whole calculated and intended effect of this Bill and of such like legislation is that the provisions and consequences of the Land Act of 1881, and the Act passed by the right hon. Gentleman himself, shall be nullified, and full and adequate compensation shall be given for the reductions of rent in Ireland by successive hauls from the Irish Church Fund. These are the reasons why we oppose this Bill. I know it will pass into law. It has been fought very steadily in this House. I do not think it has been unfairly fought, considering its importance. I believe that in another place it will be received rapturously, and welcomed with open arms. But this cannot go on for ever. The Irish landlords have got their last dole, although their clamorous demands have not yet beeen exhausted, as this Bill shows. I hope this will be the last session of the present House of Commons, and I trust that, if we all should be Members of a future House of Commons, one of the first measures which, if even the present Chief Secretary is in office, will be introduced will be one to put an end to this long and devastating social struggle between classes in Ireland, and dispose of the claims of the Irish landlords by a scheme of land purchase.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 110; Noes, 74. (Division List No. 223.)

AYES.

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.	Bethell, Commander	Butcher, John George
Arrol, Sir William	Blakiston-Houston, John	Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John	Blundell, Colonel Henry	Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r	Bond, Edward	Cecil, Evelyn, (Hertford, East)
Balfour, RtHn Gerald W (Leeds	Brassey, Albert	Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Barry, RtHnAHSmith-(Hunts	Brodrick, Rt. Hon St. John	Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. (Birm.
Beach, RtHonSirM. H. (Bristol)	Bullard, Sir Harry	Chamberlain, J. A. (Worc'r)

Mr. T. P. O'Connor.

Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Charrington, Spencer
Chelsea, Viscount
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles R.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Cornwallis, Fiennes Stanley W.
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Curzon, Viscount
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Faber, George Denison
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Foster, Colonel (Lancaster)
Fry, Lewis
Gedge, Sydney
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Goldsworthy, Major-General
Gordon, Hon. John Edward
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Green, W. D. (Wednesbury)
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Hamilton, Rt. Hn. Lord Geo.
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hanson, Sir Reginald
Hardy, Laurence
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hermon-Hodge, Robert T.
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. William
Keswick, William
Knowles, Lees
Lafone, Alfred
Lawrence, Sir E. Durning-(Corn
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks.)
Lecky, Rt. Hn. William Edw. H.
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowles, John
Macartney, W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
Manners, Lord Ed. Wm. J.
Milward, Colonel Victor
Monckton, Edward Philip
More, R. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, Hn. Fred (Monm'thsh.
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)
Mount, William George
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Pease, Herbert P. (Darlington)
Phillpotts, Captain Arthur
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Rankin, Sir James
Rentoul, James Alexander
Ridley, Rt Hn Sir Matthew, W.
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Round, James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Russell, T. W. (Tyrone)
Saunderson, Rt. Hon. Col. E. J.
Seely, Charles Hilton
Sidebotham, J. W. (Cheshire)
Sidebottom, Wm. (Derbysh.)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Smith, Abel H. (Christchurch
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Edward J. (Somerset)
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E. (Kent)
Welby, Lt-Col A. C. E. (Tauntn)
Williams, Joseph Powell- (Birm.
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, George
Wyvill, Marmaduke D'Arcy

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Sir William Walrond and
Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Ambrose, Robert
Austin, M. (Limerick, W.)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Billson, Alfred
Blake, Edward
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Commins, Andrew
Crean, Eugene
Crilly, Daniel
Curran, Thomas (Sligo, S.)
Dalziel, James Henry
Dillon, John
Doogan, P. C.
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorg.)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Fox, Dr. Joseph Francis
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert J.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Hayne, Rt. Hn. Charles Seale-
Hazell, Walter
Hogan, James Francis
Horniman, Frederick John
Jamieson, Major J. Eustace
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, David B. (Swansea)
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.
Lawson, Sir W. (Cumberland
Lough, Thomas
Macaleese, Daniel
MacDonnell, Dr. M. A. (Qn.'s C.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Dermott, Patrick
M'Ghee, Richard
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin
M'Leod, John
Maddison, Fred.
Mendl, Sigismund Ferdinand
Molloy, Bernard Charles
Moulton, John Fletcher
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Connor, Arthur (Donegal)
O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Kelly, James
O'Malley, William
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.
Pease, Joseph A. (Northumb.)
Power, Patrick Joseph
Provand, Andrew Dryburgh
Redmond John E. (Waterford)
Samuel, J. (Stockton-on-Tees)
Shaw, Chas. Ed. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire)
Stanhope, Hon. Philip J.
Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)
Sullivan, T. D. (Donegal, W.)
Tanner, Charles Kearns
Tennant, Harold John
Williams, John Carvell (Notts)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcester. N.
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Captain Donelan and Mr.
Patrick O'Brien

Main Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 94 ; Noes, 58. (Division List No. 224.)

AYES.

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds)
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H (Bristol)
Bethell, Commander
Blakiston-Houston, John
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bullard, Sir Harry
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.
Cecil, Evelyn (Hertford, East)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Charrington, Spencer
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Curzon, Viscount
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Faber, George Denison
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw-

Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Foster, Colonel (Lancaster)
Fry, Lewis
Gedge, Sydney
Godson, Sir Augustus Fred.
Goldsworthy, Major-General
Gordon, Hon. John Edward
Green, W. D. (Wednesbury)
Grenville, Hon. Ronald
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hanson, Sir Reginald
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hermon-Hodge, Robt. Trotter
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. William
Keswick, William
Knowles, Lees
Lafone, Alfred
Lawrence, Sir E Durning-(Corn.
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks.)
Lecky, Rt. Hon. William E. H.
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Macartney, W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
Manners, Lord Edward W. J.
Milward, Colonel Victor
Monckton, Edward Philip
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, Hn. F. (Monmouth.)
Mount, William George
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Pease, Herbert P. (Darlington)
Phillpotts, Captain Arthur
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Rankin, Sir James
Rentoul, James Alexander
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Round, James
Russell, T. W. (Tyrone)
Saunderson, Rt Hn Col. Edw. J.
Seely, Charles Hilton
Sidebotham, J. W. (Cheshire)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Smith, Abel H. (Christchurch)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hn. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Edw. Jas. (Somerset)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Wm Edw. Murray
Welby, Lt.-Col. A C E (Taunton
Williams, J. Powell- (Birm.)
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, George
Wyvill, Marmaduke D'Arcy

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N.E.)
Austin, M. (Limerick, W.)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Billson, Alfred
Brigg, John
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Commins, Andrew
Crean, Eugene
Crilly, Daniel
Curran, Thomas (Sligo, S.)
Dalziel, James Henry
Dillon, John
Doogan, P. C.
Evans, S. T. (Glamorgan)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Fox, Dr. Joseph Francis
Gladstone, Rt. Hon. H. J.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hogan, James Francis
Horniman, Frederick John
Jones, David B. (Swansea)
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
Lawson, Sir W. (Cumberland)
Macaleese, Daniel
MacDonnell, Dr. MA (Queen's C
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Dermott, Patrick
M'Ghee, Richard
M'Leod, John
Maddison, Fred.
Mendl, Sigismund Ferdinand
Molloy, Bernard Charles
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Connor, Arthur (Donegal)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Kelly, James
O'Malley, William
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, Joseph A. (Northumb.)
Power, Patrick Joseph
Provand, Andrew Dryburgh
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Samuel, J. (Stockton-on-Tees)
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford
Stanhope, Hon Philip J.
Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)
Sullivan, T. D. (Donegal, W.)
Tanner, Charles Kearns
Tennant, Harold John
Williams, John Carvell (Notts.
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

FACTORIES AND WORKSHOPS BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged; Bill withdrawn.

YOUTHFUL OFFENDERS BILL [Lords].

Order for resuming adjourned Debate on Amendment to Second Reading [21st May] read, and discharged; Bill withdrawn.

SAVINGS BANKS AND FRIENDLY SOCIETIES BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged; Bill withdrawn.

DOGS REGULATION BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged; Bill withdrawn.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL [Lords].

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged; Bill withdrawn.

PALATINE COURT OF DURHAM BILL [Lords].

Order for resuming Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [2nd April] read, and discharged; Bill withdrawn.

REFORMATORY AND INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged; Bill withdrawn.

LUNACY BILL [Lords].

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged; Bill withdrawn.

MILITARY MANŒUVRES BILL [Lords].

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged; Bill withdrawn.

In pursuance of the Order of the House of this day, Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at a quarter before Two of the clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, 17th July, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with :—

London (St. Luke) Provisional Order.
London (Southwark) Provisional Order.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

GREAT WESTERN RAILWAY BILL.

The Queen's consent, and the consent of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales in right of his Duchy of Cornwall, signified ; and Bill reported from the Select Committee with Amendments.

ABERDEEN CORPORATION TRAMWAYS BILL.

CUMBERLAND COUNTY COUNCIL (BRIDGES) BILL.

Reported with Amendments.

LONDON AND NORTH-WESTERN RAILWAY (WALES) BILL.

Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, the opposition thereto having been withdrawn ; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. The Orders made on the 25th of June and 6th July last discharged ; and Bill committed.

GREAT INDIAN PENINSULA RAILWAY COMPANY BILL.

Moved, That the Order made on the 12th day of March last, "That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after Tuesday the 26th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2^a ; agreed to ; Bill read 2^a accordingly.

BRAY URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL BILL.

Read 3^a, and passed.

LANCASHIRE, DERBYSHIRE, AND EAST COAST RAILWAY BILL.

Read 3^a, with the Amendments ; further Amendments made ; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.

LAMBETH WATER BILL.

Read 3^a, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

NORTH METROPOLITAN ELECTRIC POWER SUPPLY BILL.

SOUTH WALES ELECTRICAL POWER DISTRIBUTION BILL.

Brought from the Commons ; read 1^a ; and referred to the Examiners.

WATER ORDERS CONFIRMATION BILL [H.L.].

WESTGATE AND BIRCHINGTON WATER BILL [H.L.].

Returned from the Commons agreed to.

LEE CONSERVANCY BILL.

NORTH METROPOLITAN RAILWAY AND CANAL BILL.

Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

GAS ORDERS CONFIRMATION (No. 1) BILL [H.L.].

FALKIRK AND DISTRICT WATER BILL [H.L.].

Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments.

HAMILTON, MOTHERWELL, AND WISHAW TRAMWAYS BILL.

Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to, with an Amendment.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 12) BILL.

Committed to a Committee of the whole House.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 14) BILL.

Committed : The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 10) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 11) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 13) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDER (HOUSING OF WORKING CLASSES) BILL.

House in Committee (according to Order) ; Bills reported without amendment ; Standing Committee negatived ; and Bills to be read 3^a on Thursday next.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 1) BILL.

Amendments reported (according to Order), and Bill to be read 3ª on Thursday next.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 5) BILL.

Read 3ª (according to Order), and passed.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 12) BILL.

Read 3ª (according to Order), with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 8) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (POOR LAW) BILL.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 9) BILL.

Read 3ª (according to Order), and passed.

PIER AND HARBOUR PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 2) BILL.

Amendments reported (according to Order), and Bill to be read 3ª on Thursday next.

LONDON (CLERKENWELL AND HOLBORN) PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

LONDON (POPLAR) PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

House in Committee (according to Order); Bills reported without Amendment; Standing Committee negatived; and Bills to be read 3ª on Thursday next.

EAST LONDON WATER BILL.

ROCHDALE CORPORATION BILL.

WEST HAM CORPORATION BILL.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 10) BILL.

PLYMOUTH, STONEHOUSE, AND DEVONPORT TRAMWAYS BILL.

CROYDON TRAMWAYS AND IMPROVEMENTS BILL.

LONDON COUNTY TRAMWAYS (No. 2) BILL.

LONDON COUNTY TRAMWAYS (No. 1) BILL.

KINGSCOURT, KEADY, AND ARMAGH RAILWAY BILL.

NEWRY, KEADY, AND TYNAN LIGHT RAILWAY BILL.

GREAT NORTHERN RAILWAY (IRELAND) BILL.

Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Earl Temple be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Lord Stanmore; read, and agreed to.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS.

I. Annual Series:—No. 2474. Italy (Sardinia); No. 2475. Brazil (Rio de Janeiro); No. 2476. United States (Boston); No. 2477. Turkey (Erzeroum); No. 2478. China (Chefoo).

II. Miscellaneous Series:—No. 534. Present state of Belgian coal, metal, and glass industries.

CAPE COLONY.

Correspondence relating to the affairs of the Cape Colony.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT (1897) EXTENSION BILL.

Returned from the Commons with the Amendment agreed to.

POOR REMOVAL BILL.

Reported from the Standing Committee without amendment, and to be read 3ª on Thursday next.

DIOCESAN REGISTRATION BILL [H.L.].

Reported from the Standing Committee without further amendment; the Report of the amendments made in Committee of the whole House to be received on Thursday next.

BEER RETAILERS' AND SPIRIT GROCERS' LICENCES (IRELAND) (No. 2) BILL.

Reported from the Standing Committee without further amendment; the Report of the Amendments made in Committee of the whole House to be received on Monday next.

CHARITABLE LOANS (IRELAND) BILL.

Reported from the Standing Committee without amendment, and to be read 3ª on Thursday next.

CRUELTY TO WILD ANIMALS IN CAPTIVITY BILL.

Reported from the Standing Committee without further amendment: the Report of the Amendments made in Committee of the whole House to be received on Tuesday next.

MERCHANT SHIPPING (LIABILITY OF SHIPOWNERS AND OTHERS) BILL.

Reported from the Standing Committee without further amendment; the Report of the Amendment made in Committee of the whole House to be received on Thursday next.

MEMBERS OF LOCAL AUTHORITIES RELIEF BILL [H.L.]

Reported from the Standing Committee with further Amendments; the Report of the Amendments made in Committee of the Whole House and by the Standing Committee, to be received on Thursday next; and Bill to be printed as amended. (No. 189.)

COUNTY COURTS (IRELAND) BILL [H.L.].

VETERINARY SURGEONS (AMENDMENT) BILL.

Reported from the Standing Committee without Amendment, and to be read 3ª on Thursday next.

TITHE RENT-CHARGE (IRELAND) BILL.

Brought from the Commons. Read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª on Thursday next.—(*The Lord Ashbourne.*) (No. 190.)

COUNTY AND BOROUGH FRANCHISE ASSIMILATION (LONDON) BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

*LORD FARQUHAR: My Lords, so complicated is the subject of the qualification of an elector that any measure which simplifies it will, I am sure, be welcomed by your Lordships. The object of this Bill, which we may justly term a non-contentious Bill, is to assimilate the County Council with the parochial register, and to obviate the anomaly of two classes of electors in London for local government purposes; an anomaly that will become more marked when the elections under the London Government Act, 1899, take place. The duties of the local and central authorities in London are so analogous that the distinction in the franchise was founded on no principle of logic, economy, or convenience. On the contrary, it has caused a great deal of confusion, and has made the registration both complicated and expensive. This Bill does not in any way interfere with the Parliamentary franchise, nor does it create a new franchise. It has to do purely with the domestic affairs of London, and is introduced to remedy a disparity in the electorate which has no analogy in the rest of the country. It will remove an anomaly in the London franchise by which those who hold the lodger and service franchise — about 100,000 in number—while having the right to vote in parochial elections, are denied the right to vote for the County Council. The Bill will also put the register for the London County Council and the register for the new London Borough Councils on the same basis, thereby contributing greatly to the simplification of the preparation of the voters' lists. In 1894 lodgers and service voters were allowed to vote for vestries and poor-law guardians, the former being the rate-paying authority, and the two together being responsible for two-thirds of the rate levied. We contend that a man who is entitled to vote for the rate-paying authority should also be entitled to vote for the spending body. This discrepancy in the franchise may be termed of fortuitous creation, and its assimilation would be but a logical evolution. The London County Council have unanimously approved of this change, and the Bill has passed through the House of Commons without any objection being raised to it.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Lord Farquhar.*)

LORD TWEEDMOUTH: My Lords, I am very glad to be able to support most cordially the Second Reading of this Bill, and I do so because on this side of the House all extensions of the franchise are welcomed, even though, as in this case, they are not likely to operate favourably to our own cause. The effect of this Bill is to add three classes of electors to the county council electors in London. At this moment the London County Council

electors consist of two classes—householders and women. To those classes will be added by this Bill lodgers, service voters, and freeholders. I am afraid we who hold Liberal opinions do not expect to get much advantage from the addition of those voters to the register; but we welcome the power being given them to vote, because we believe that the wider the basis of the franchise the better it will be for the country. We may, however, justly complain that when this measure was brought in the opportunity was not taken to remove some of the gross anomalies which exist with regard to the period required for the qualification to vote. The desire of the promoters of this Bill is to enable more people to vote, and one would have imagined that they would also have endeavoured to make it as easy as possible for men to get upon the register. They make no change in regard to the period of occupation, and a man who enters into occupation in August will still be unable to get upon the register for twenty-three months. That is a gross anomaly in the present law, and one which should be remedied. Even though it may be argued that it is not desirable to reduce the period of qualification for the Parliamentary franchise, surely for local purposes the qualification might be reduced to six months. If this were done a great boon would be conferred upon Londoners. I think a considerable burden of responsibility lies on the promoters of the Bill for not having proposed some reform in the way I have suggested.

*Lord JAMES of HEREFORD: My Lords, I have been asked to state what are the views of the Local Government Board with regard to this Bill, which is not without its importance as a matter of principle, the proposition before the House being to add some 100,000 voters to the register of the London County Council. The men it is now proposed to enfranchise have not hitherto been placed on the register of voters for the London County Council, in pursuance of the principle that those who elect the body who impose a rate should bear the burden of that rate. In 1894 the lodger and service suffrages were conferred in respect of the vestries. By the Act of last year the London municipalities became the successors of the vestries, and had conferred upon them the same powers of voting as the vestries had. That being so, the anomaly arises that there are in London two rating bodies—the London County Council and the municipalities. The object of my noble friend's Bill is that throughout the rating area the franchise shall be the same. The Government do not oppose the Bill, but they wish it to be quite understood that the measure must not be taken as a precedent for endeavouring to depart from the principle I have mentioned in cases where the anomaly which prevails in London does not exist. And if, therefore, it should be sought to extend these non-rate paying branches to provincial county councils and municipal boroughs, the question involved must be regarded as being in no way affected by the fact that this Bill has been allowed to become law.

On Question, agreed to. Bill read 2ª accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the whole House on Friday next.

ATTENDANCE OF PEERS ON COMMITTEES.

The Earl of CAMPERDOWN: The information for which I move is, I believe, kept in the House, and if it were printed and circulated, it would give a good deal of valuable information to your Lordships. I therefore move for the Return standing in my name.

Moved, for a Return showing the attendance of individual Peers on Select Committees in 1897, 1898, 1899; and distinguishing Committees on Private Bills.—(*Earl of Camperdown.*)

On Question, agreed to.

Return ordered to be laid before the House.

WAR OFFICE RECONSTRUCTION AND ARMY REORGANISATION.

*The Duke of BEDFORD: My Lords, in asking the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for War the question standing in my name, I need not detain your Lordships by a long list of military deficiencies, or a long indictment of the War Office. I think I may safely claim a concensus of opinion as to the necessity for the reconstruction of the War Office. I use the word "reconstruction" in the

sense of building anew upon a cleared site, as opposed to patching up an antiquated structure. I apprehend that a patch-work policy would not be acceptable to your Lordships. For instance, an inquiry into the War Office by officials and ex-officials, or still more useless, an inquiry by means of a Departmental Committee. Possibly the noble Marquess could indicate in outline the principles upon which the Department over which he presides will in due course be reconstructed. At the very beginning of the South African campaign the Commander in Chief advised the country that war was a game of ups and downs. But of the latter we have experienced a greater share than can be fairly ascribed to bad luck alone. It is from the real reasons for our reverses, and not from the supposed causes of our successes, that the most valuable lessons of the war are to be learnt. It is impossible to conceive any scheme for Army reorganisation at the present moment which has not been preceded by an inquiry into the reasons for our failures in South Africa. But, my Lords, if such an inquiry is to command the confidence of the country, if it is to arouse that national interest in military matters indispensable for the future development of the Army, its results must be submitted to the judgment of Parliament. It is essential that Parliament should know the advice upon which the Secretary of State founds his plan of reconstruction. When we know the real reasons for our disasters, then we can take the first step towards the reorganisation of the Army. The second step is the formation of a correct idea of the military needs of the Empire. Previous to the present war, the defence of the Empire was considered amply secured by two Army corps for service abroad, and one for home defence. In round numbers that means 120,000 men. We have now an army of more than 220,000 men in South Africa, in addition to our home forces. With an error so colossal as the basis of all calculation in time of peace, there is small wonder that war should have revealed dangerous military deficiencies. This miscalculation seems to me in no way the fault of the War Office. The War Office was told, I presume, by the Cabinet that its maximum output was to be three army corps. On the outbreak of war it was not three army corps but the equivalent of six army corps for which provision was wanted. It is most important that the country should know who will be responsible in the future for calculating the military needs of the Empire. The reorganisation of the Army is one matter. To fill the ranks with men of the right stamp is another. Unless Her Majesty's Government can solve the problem of recruiting, manifestly the solution of all other military problems will be of no value, because the Army will have no men. The receipt for increasing the quantity of recruits has hitherto been to diminish their quality—that is, to lower the standard of physical development. The noble Marquess has told us that he does not think an increase of pay for the Army and the Militia would give results proportionate to the increased expenditure. I do not know why the noble Marquess considers that the Army should form the solitary exception to those influences which always have governed, and still govern, the labour market of the world, namely wages. I recognise that to increase the pay of the Army is to incur a great cost which is in itself a great evil. But in my opinion conscription is a greater evil, and the greatest evil of all is a wholly insufficient Army. It is scarcely possible to separate at the present moment the reconstruction of the War Office and the reorganisation of the Army from the still wider question of Imperial defence. Until a few months ago it was an article of faith in this country that the fate of the Empire would be decided by battles fought either upon the sea, or, if the worst came to the worst, at home. Recent events have shown that such decisive battles may be fought, and probably will be fought, neither upon the sea nor in the United Kingdom, but in Africa, in Asia, or in some other continent. Hence the pressing need of a comprehensive plan for Imperial defence. From among the many lessons of the war in South Africa, one stands out like stone, and it is this, that without the help of our colonies we should never have gone through with the war in the way which we have done. Presumably in any scheme of Imperial defence the colonies will be invited to join, as may seem good to themselves. Then, if we are to have an Imperial Army, is it to be a paper army only, or will it be assembled from time to time for the purposes of training and comradeship? Now,

an Imperial Army can no more be trained for the field in England than a racehorse can be trained to gallop in a kitchen garden. Where, then, is the Imperial Army of the future to receive its field training? Is such a force to be trained where the Imperial Army now is, and where a strong garrison must always be maintained, in South Africa? South Africa is close to India and the East. It is not far from Egypt and the Mediterranean. It is a half-way house for Australia and New Zealand. It is not, as we gratefully acknowledge, beyond the reach of Canada. Then the climate is magnificent, and the area for field training and manœuvres unlimited. Finally, the concentration for the field training of an Imperial Army in South Africa would perfect our system of sea transport for cavalry, artillery, and infantry, and enable us to acquire that rapid mobility which the defence of our Empire absolutely demands. I have brought these questions to the notice of the noble Marquess, well knowing that it is impossible for Her Majesty's Government to deal with them during this session; but before next session we hope to welcome home a victorious army. My Lords, I fear lest that triumphant return, by obliterating the memory of disasters, should become the means of establishing more firmly than ever that old order which ought now to change and give place to the new. I therefore beg to ask the noble Marquess whether Her Majesty's Government intend to inquire into the deficiencies of our military system, and to submit the results to Parliament with a view to the reconstruction of the War Office and the reorganisation of the Army.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (The Marquess of LANSDOWNE): My Lords, we are most anxious to withhold from your Lordships' House no information with regard to military matters which you may reasonably desire to possess, and I think I shall not be contradicted when I say that during the debates that have taken place this year we have invariably given the House frank and full information both with regard to matters of fact, and, as far as possible, with regard to our own intentions. But I think the questions which the noble Duke has addressed to me carry us to a point at which I may fairly ask, and at which I think the noble Duke himself will almost expect me to ask, for your forbearance. Indeed, the noble Duke, in his concluding words, made it, I think, pretty clear that he did not expect that I should give him a full and detailed answer upon the many points he referred to. He asked me whether it was our intention to institute an inquiry into the deficiencies of our military system; whether that inquiry would be made with a view to the reconstruction of the War Office and the reorganisation of the Army; whether I could place him in possession of the principles upon which that reconstruction was to take place; whether we were informing ourselves as to the causes of the reverses which had been sustained during the course of the South African campaign; whether we were seriously addressing ourselves to the recruiting problem; whether we were forecasting the military needs of the Empire; whether we were elaborating a scheme of Imperial defence in which the colonies were to have a part, and which, as I understand the noble Duke, was to involve a system of training the Imperial Army partly upon the sea and partly in South Africa; and finally, whether we were going to submit the whole of our proposals to Parliament. I venture to say that in the history of Parliament so many formidable questions were never compressed into a speech so brief as that which the noble Duke has delivered. I cannot give the noble Duke information upon the whole of these points—upon some of them we do not possess the information ourselves; but if the object of the noble Duke is to obtain from me a general assurance that it is the intention of the Government to spare no effort to turn to account the experience acquired during the course of the present campaign, that assurance I give him in the strongest and most unqualified terms. I say, further, that if the conclusions to be derived from that experience are such as to lead to the belief that changes are necessary either in the organisation of the Army or in the system under which the Army is administered, we shall approach those questions with minds unbiassed by preconceived opinions, and with the determination to ask Parliament for the means of giving effect to any changes which may be proved to be necessary. But in a case of this kind it is surely true to say that the only solid foundation upon which we can set to work

is a foundation of ascertained facts, and with many of the facts we must perforce at present be but imperfectly acquainted while the war is still in progress. Until those facts have been ascertained I do not think it will be possible for me to give the noble Duke any information as to the extent to which either the reorganisation of the Army or the reconstruction of the War Office might possibly be desirable; still less can I tell him, even in outline, upon what principles that reconstruction is likely to proceed. Reorganisation and reconstruction are very big words; they are words which seem to afford infinite consolation to the minds of many people who use them; but they are not only very big words, they are very vague words, and I confess I prefer not to use them until I have in my mind a clear idea of the meaning which I wish to convey by their use. That this war will lead to changes in the organisation of the Army, in its training and equipment, I feel myself very little doubt. But I would put it to the noble Duke and to your Lordships' House that we can scarcely condemn the whole of the old machinery, we can scarcely begin to construct new machinery, until we have made ourselves fully aware of the extent to which the old machinery has broken down, the points at which it has failed, and, above all, whether the failure has been due to imperfections of the machinery itself or to errors on the part of those who had control of and directed its operations. While the war in South Africa is still in progress we cannot obtain evidence upon many of these points. We cannot yet obtain a class of evidence to which I, for my part, attach very great importance—I mean the evidence not of the critics, but of the men who have seen the conduct of these operations upon the spot, and to whom the success or failure of the present system has been a matter of life or death. When the campaign is over, as we all hope it will be before long, we shall, I have no doubt, have ample opportunities of conferring with distinguished soldiers who will be able to give us most valuable evidence on points of that kind. I would add that where the war has taught us already a lesson which appeared to us clear and unmistakable we have not hesitated to take action. I cite in support of this what we are doing in regard to the increase and rearmament of the artillery, which is already proceeding; I cite also the large measures which are now in progress for building up a sufficient reserve of military stores and equipment of all kinds, stores which have, in my opinion, at no time been maintained at a sufficient amount, and which we mean to accumulate in large quantities, and under conditions which I hope will render it incumbent not only upon us, but upon those who may follow us to make good at once any deficiency in those reserves created by the exceptional demands of a great campaign. The noble Duke indicated not obscurely his own preference for an external inquiry of some kind. I should like to throw out for his consideration, and that of those who believe that Committees and Commissions are a panacea for all the ills of the body politic, this reflection—if you wish for speedy and effectual improvements, are you quite sure that inquiry by Royal Commission is the best way of obtaining it? When you have collected those men of sound common sense—who, the experience of the last few days seems to show, are either very rare or very reluctant to place their services at the disposal of the country—they are apt to proceed with very great deliberation and care. The result is, a long time passes while the inquiry is proceeding, and you are very fortunate indeed if you get advice on which you can act at once without further delay and without further investigation. With regard to the noble Duke's suggestion that whatever we may determine to do should be fully submitted to the judgment of Parliament, I cannot conceive that any considerable changes either in Army organisation or administration should be made except under conditions which would leave to Parliament the fullest opportunity of criticism and review. I feel perfectly confident that whatever is done the noble Duke and other Members of the House who take an active interest in the affairs of the Army will not be denied the amplest opportunity of discussing and considering our proposals.

EARL SPENCER: My Lords, I think we ought to be very grateful to the noble Duke for having brought this subject forward. I think we may also congratulate ourselves on the fact that the criticisms of the War Office and our generals in the field have been free from the party spirit which marked the time

of the great Duke of Wellington and the Crimean war. No doubt that has been brought about, to a great extent, by modern facilities of communication. We now have the telegraph at work, and any criticism that is made here is immediately reported, not only to our generals, who may be affected, but also to our opponents in the field. As I have said, I think it is a matter of congratulation that this change has taken place. But at the same time it is imperative on the Government to look facts in the face and see, not only what defects exist in the organisation of the Army at home, but what militates against success in carrying on war in a foreign country. No doubt things have taken place which show the necessity for changes. We think that the opportunity must be seized to look into these matters in time of peace, in order to make such arrangements as will prevent their recurrence. We shall probably be obliged to keep a considerable force in South Africa for some time to come, but the training of the Army will surely take place in England rather than in South Africa. I can hardly think that the noble Duke means that the main instruction should be given to our Army in South Africa. The noble Duke seems to look for some Commission or inquiry independent of Her Majesty's Government. I venture to differ from him entirely in that. I think the Government of the day themselves must be responsible for a thorough, entire, and complete investigation into the management of the war, and if they do not deal with it completely and satisfactorily it will be for Parliament to take vigorous action if they consider the action of the Government is not sufficient. I hope no Commission will be appointed, and that the Government will investigate the whole matter themselves.

*The Earl of WEMYSS: My Lords, I am very glad to find myself in agreement with the Secretary of State for War on two points. He said that reorganisation and reconstruction were two very large words, and with that description I agree. I think the noble Duke has done good service in bringing this matter forward, but I agree with the Secretary of State for War that the words reorganisation and reconstruction do not apply to the situation. Attention is required not to reconstruction and reorganisation, but to what is signified by another big word —namely, "administration." I believe that our Army system is perfectly right and sound if properly administered. Thus we found ourselves in South Africa without big movable guns of position, such as the Boers had; such, too, as we found, through the taking of the Tienstin arsenal, that the Chinese have in abundance. And had it not been for the naval guns, thirty-five of which were borrowed from the Navy and made available by Captain Scott—a service for which a C.B. appears to be a poor reward —we should, as President Kruger intended, have been driven into the sea. The irony of the situation is that we had in 1860 big movable guns of position, but the improvement in the field gun rendered these obsolete, and no step had from that time to this been taken to obtain a big movable gun of position, the relative up-to-date equivalent of the gun of 1860. Now, this is an administrative scandal. It is not, I repeat, a question of reorganisation or reconstruction, but of administration. There is someone responsible in the organisation of the War Office for this deficiency. That man ought to be found out and hanged.

Lord TWEEDMOUTH: My Lords, I wish to say a word on a subject which has not been dealt with—namely, the pressing need of attention being given to the question of remounts. This war has been essentially a cavalry war. But again and again throughout the campaign we have seen our cavalry helpless for want of horses. Porter's Brigade, which was sent to the assistance of Broadwood at Koornspruit, and which should have had 1,500 men, arrived with only 150. I heard of another brigade being ordered south from Pretoria which should have had 1,500 horses but which only had 300, and I am told that the horses which they did have were not capable in many cases of standing a three days march. I believe that many of the difficulties with regard to remounts might have been avoided if proper arrangements had been made in the past for the supply of horses as they were required. We should have done much better if, before the men went out, horses had been gathered in South Africa ready for them. Even in this country the whole system of the purchase of remounts has been one which would not commend itself to impartial inquirers and observers; £30 and £40 have been paid

for horses which turned out useless in South Africa, quite breaking down under the severe test applied to them. I hope the question of remounts will be carefully inquired into, because in the immediate future, more than in the past, our success in the battlefield will depend on the efficiency of our cavalry.

THE MARQUESS OF GRANBY: My Lords, the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for War justly took upon his Department credit for the greatly improved condition of stores and equipment—

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: What I said was that our reserves of military stores had, in my opinion, never been as large as they should have been, and that we were already, as one of the lessons of the war, greatly increasing the amount of those reserves.

THE MARQUESS OF GRANBY: I apologise for not quoting the noble Marquess correctly, but we mean very much the same thing. I would point out that there are deficiencies still existing in regard to our troops at home. I am cognisant myself of one regiment of Volunteers, consisting of two battalions, which is going into camp within the next ten days. They would go in 1,500 strong, but are 350 rifles short. A recruit without a rifle is not much good, and I think this is a point which deserves the careful attention of the War Office.

LORD HENEAGE: My Lords, I should like to ask why faith has not been kept with the Militia regiments embodied in the spring in the matter of tents. At the present moment, instead of every officer having a tent to himself, as Volunteer officers have when they are sent into camp, two officers have to go into one tent. Exactly the same thing happens with regard to the men in their proportions, and the men have been crowded to a far greater extent than was anticipated. I should like to support the observations of Lord Tweedmouth. There cannot be the slightest doubt that over and over again troops in South Africa have been obliged to stand still because they had no horses for the cavalry, and when they had them, many of the horses could not do the work. I venture to say that in the recent marches in the Transvaal there have been more horses tethered behind wagons without saddles than there have been with men on their backs. I hope the question of remounts will be one to which the Government will give their earliest attention.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: It does not, I am sorry to say, at all surprise me to find that there has been a short supply of tents, and that consequently the men have been crowded into a less number of tents than would otherwise have been the case. The difficulty of obtaining tents is enormous. The number of contractors who are able to supply tents of suitable quality is very limited indeed, and if my noble friend is able to put me in the way of discovering new sources of supply from which additional tents can be obtained he will earn my gratitude and that of the Director-General of Ordnance, who for many months past has been at his wits end over this question. With regard to remounts, I am quite ready to believe that the experience of this war may have some very valuable and instructive results; but I rather wish to demur to the suggestion made by the noble Lord on the front bench opposite (Lord Tweedmouth), and, I think, repeated by the noble Lord below the gangway (Lord Heneage), that because at particular moments our troops had been brought to a standstill for the want of horses, that was necessarily due to shortcomings in the supply of remounts. We all know that for many weeks Lord Roberts was dependent for all his supplies upon a single line of railway, and that it was only with the greatest difficulty, in the earlier days after his arrival at Bloemfontein, and again at Pretoria, that he was able to secure for his troops the food and forage which was essential for their existence. It was perfectly well known that at that moment he was unable to get up the horses which were actually in the Cape Colony, as they had either to travel on their legs or to wait until other more important stores and equipments had been conveyed to the front. With regard to the complaint of my noble friend below the gangway (the Marquess of Granby), I am afraid that it may be the case that the corps in which he is interested have had to wait for rifles; but the noble Marquess must be aware that the demands on the Ordnance Department have been

enormous of late, and it is quite conceivable that from entirely unavoidable circumstances rifles may not have been supplied as punctually as would otherwise be the case.

GIBRALTAR, MALTA, AND HONG KONG — DOCK ACCOMMODATION — NEW WORKS.

VISCOUNT SIDMOUTH: My Lords, I rise to ask Her Majesty's Government whether information can be supplied respecting the present condition and progress of the new works at Gibraltar dockyard and breakwater; and whether the proposed new docks at Malta and Hong Kong are in progress. I am sorry to have to trouble the noble Earl who represents the Admiralty in this House, and who, I am sure, we all congratulate on the very high position to which he has been appointed;* but I am obliged to do so owing to the Naval Estimates not being supplied to this House. The three docks at Gibraltar are, I understand, still under construction, and only one is capable of receiving a first-class ironclad. Since the zealous and able administration of the noble Earl opposite (Earl Spencer), we have been promised an additional dock at Malta, where there are at present four docks, but only one of which, I think, is capable of receiving the large vessels now built for the Navy. This is the only accommodation we have for the largely increased number of ships we are obliged to maintain in the Mediterranean. The breakwater is another question on which I desire information. It must be obvious to everyone of your Lordships that the dock accommodation for our squadrons ought to be very greatly increased, more especially when we look at the fact that a foreign nation has very large dock accommodation at three or four ports in the Mediterranean. It is necessary that we should have accommodation for the repair of our ships in case of emergency. The docks at Gibraltar not being ready, we should have to fall back upon the small accommodation which Malta provides. A promise was also made of a dock at Hong Kong. So far as I can ascertain there is only one dock there, and that is not capable of receiving vessels of the size we are now sending out to the East.

* It was announced on the 14th July that the Earl of Hopetoun had been appointed first Governor-General of the Commonwealth of Australia.

The Marquess of Lansdowne.

THE EARL OF HOPETOUN: My Lords, full information as to the progress made with these works up to the end of February of this year will be found in the First Lord's statement accompanying the Naval Estimates for 1900-1.* Since that time a further length of 1,000 feet of the detached mole at Gibraltar has been brought above water level. The dam for No. 3 Dock has been completed, and the enclosed area is being pumped out. The progress made with the works generally is satisfactory. It is not expected that a contract for the construction of the new docks at Malta will be let before November next, but in the meantime the clearing and levelling of the site is proceeding rapidly. At Hong Kong the main works are in process of construction, but the dock cannot be begun until further progress has been made with the reclamation.

EARL SPENCER: My Lords, though it is absolutely essential, in view of the increased number of ships kept in the Mediterranean, that there should be increased accommodation both at Malta and Gibraltar, it can hardly be expected that we should have at those places accommodation as good as that which the French have in the same waters, for your Lordships must remember that these are the home dockyards of France, which correspond to Plymouth and Portsmouth in this country. With regard to Hong Kong, everybody must admit, particularly in view of the lamentable circumstances which have recently occurred in China, the immense importance of keeping up a sufficient fleet in those seas. As to the works at Hong Kong, I confess that I was not altogether satisfied with the site taken for them, and I am still rather afraid that the site will not be sufficiently large to give all the accommodation that will be required in the near future. At the present moment, as I understand it, Her Majesty's Government are proposing to build another dock at Victoria Island on the Hong Kong side of the bay, and I would like to know from the noble Earl whether it is intended that it should accommodate the largest cruiser or battleship of the present day.

VISCOUNT SIDMOUTH: The noble Earl did not say when the works at Gibraltar were likely to be completed,

* See *The Parliamentary Debates* [Fourth Series], Vol. lxxix., Appendix.

or when one of the docks was likely to be used.

THE EARL OF HOPETOUN: I am afraid, with the knowledge which is at present at my disposal, that I cannot answer either of the questions which have been put to me.

DEATH CERTIFICATION.

LORD MONKSWELL: My Lords, I rise to call attention to the Report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons in 1893 on Death Certification, stating that "the existing procedure plays into the hands of the criminal classes"; and to ask whether the Government propose to introduce legislation in accordance with the recommendations of the Committee. I do not propose to go further back into the history of this matter than 6th January, 1893, when Mr. Asquith, who was then Home Secretary, received a deputation consisting of, amongst others, the eminent surgeon, Sir Henry Thompson, who made a speech in which he showed that the state of the law with regard to death certification was extremely inefficient, and, indeed, dangerous to the public safety. He showed that a large number of burials took place without any death certificate being produced at all; that in Edinburgh, for instance, as many as 8 per cent. of the burials were uncertificated; that in the remoter parts of Scotland between 25 and 45 per cent. of burials were of persons whose deaths had not been certified; and that in a great many cases the certificates when produced were absolutely valueless, as they were either given by incompetent persons or by competent persons on insufficient information. Mr. Asquith was very much impressed with the statement of Sir Henry Thompson, and he formed a Select Committee of the House of Commons to take the matter into consideration. Sir Walter Foster, who was then Secretary to the Local Government Board, was in the chair, and the Committee, in the course of their Report, used the words which I have put into my motion. They said that—

> "The existing procedure plays into the hands of the criminal classes."

They also said—

> "The Committee are much impressed with the serious possibilities implied in a system which permits death and burial to take place without the production of satisfactory evidence of the cause of death. . . . Your Committee are convinced that vastly more deaths occur annually from foul play and criminal neglect than the law recognises."

In 1896, Sir Richard Quain, as President of the General Medical Council, had a correspondence on the subject with the Registrar General, but all he could get out of him was an acknowledgment that the law was in an exceedingly bad state. Nothing could be done at that time. In May, 1899, the General Medical Council again took the matter up, and the following resolution was passed—

> "That the President be authorised to forward to the Registrar General the whole of the correspondence that has passed on the subject of death certification, and to make further representations to the Registrar General as to the importance and urgency of the question."

Since my notice has been on the Paper I have had a letter from the master of the workhouse of St. Olave's Union, Bermondsey, stating that he is exceedingly dissatisfied with the present state of the law. I do not think the remedy that ought to be applied is far to seek. There is another part of the Report of the Committee that I ought to read as bearing upon the remedy. With regard to the practice of cremation the Committee say—

> "Your Committee are of opinion that with the precautions adopted in connection with cremation as carried out by the Cremation Society, there is little probability that cases of crime would escape detection."

The question I should like to ask the Local Government Board is this: Why should the law efficiently protect only members of the Cremation Society? Mr. Asquith considered that the time was ripe for legislation, and in 1895, before he quitted office, he had, I understand, given some consideration to the preparation of a Bill on this matter. I do not, of course, suggest that Her Majesty's Government should introduce legislation this session; but I understand that the usual way in which Ministers spend their vacation is in considering legislation that they wish to bring forward in the following session. I have no reason to suppose that on this occasion Ministers will not comply with that time-honoured custom, and I hope that while they are giving the question of legislation their best consideration they will also consider the question of efficient death certificates worthy of their attention.

LORD HARRIS: My Lords, I am not prepared to say how the President of the Local Government Board intends to spend the next vacation, nor, indeed, am I in a position to say how he has spent past vacations. But I can assure the noble Lord that this matter, which undoubtedly is a very important one, has engaged Mr. Chaplin's attention for some time with a view to bringing in a Bill. There are, however, a good many difficulties connected with it, and he is at present having inquiry made by the officers of the Local Government Board with a view to getting over those difficulties which have presented themselves at different times to those who were anxious to legislate on the subject. He is in hopes that at no very distant date he will see a way of overcoming those difficulties, and be able to introduce a Bill on the lines suggested by the noble Lord.

LORD MONKSWELL: I should have been glad if the noble Lord had specified the difficulties which he says stand in the way of legislation on this question. I cannot understand how there can be any difficulties.

House adjourned at Five minutes before Six of the clock, to Thursday next, half-past Ten of the clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 17th July, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

GAS ORDER CONFIRMATION (No. 2) BILL [Lords] (BY ORDER.)

Order read for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment to Question [3rd July], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

And which Amendment was—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Mr. Doogan.*)

Question again proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Debate resumed.

*THE SECRETARY TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. T. W. RUSSELL, Tyrone, S.): It will be in the recollection of the House——

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Gentleman has already spoken on this motion, and he can now only do so by the indulgence of the House.

*MR. T. W. RUSSELL: I am pleading for that indulgence. When this matter was before the House a fortnight ago I suggested an adjournment, in order that negotiations might go forward for the purchase of the gas company's undertaking, and I wish now to state that, although originally the local authority offered £7,000 and the company asked for £9,000, that during the interval the council have raised their offer to £8,000 and the company have reduced their demand to £8,500, so that now there is only a difference of £500 between the parties. Although I have worked very hard, I have failed to get rid of that difference, and the Order must, therefore, now be either approved or rejected by the House. I should like to say that the Order is a very serious matter for the town, because it fixes the capital of the company at £9,000, the maximum price to be charged at 5s. 10d. per 1,000 feet, and the maximum dividend at 10 per cent. So far as I am personally concerned I intend to vote against the Second Reading of the Bill, because it will put the town in such a bad position. I think the municipality is entitled to some consideration at the hands of this House, and as this is not a Government matter, and as Irish representatives, north and south, are unanimous on the point, I shall vote against the confirmation of the Order.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): I only wish to say a few words. The case is an exceedingly hard one for the citizens of Dungannon. They have been charged for many years a price for gas which is considerably above that charged in other towns in Ireland or even in Great Britain. This Provisional Order proposes to maintain the enormous maximum price of 5s. 10d., whereas in neighbouring places it varies from 3s. 6d. to 4s., and that is done solely for the purpose of ensuring the payment of the maximum dividend of 10 per cent. on an inflated capital. In the last debate it was clearly shown that the actual

cash expenditure from the pockets of the shareholders had been only £4,200, the remainder of the money expended on the works having been taken out of the profits in excess of the 10 per cent. That has been done by charging an enormous price for gas, and the ratepayers of Dungannon are now asked to give the company twice as much as they have had to find out of their own pockets. In the future if this Order is confirmed they will continue to pay 5s. 10d. per 1,000 feet in order that the shareholders may get 10 per cent. on their inflated capital. I hope, therefore, the motion for Second Reading will be rejected.

MR. SAMUEL YOUNG (Cavan, E.): Rather than reject the Bill to-day, why not pass the Second Reading, let the negotiations be continued, and then if no agreement is arrived at settle the contentious point on the motion for Third Reading?

*MR. T. W. RUSSELL: I cannot consent to that. The end of the session is so near that there would not be sufficient time to discuss the matter, should it on the Third Reading be found necessary to recommit the Bill. No one can be prejudiced if the Order is now thrown out. The whole matter can come up again next session.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. JESSE COLLINGS, Birmingham, Bordesley): In the absence of the President of the Board of Trade I was requested to move the Second Reading of this Bill. Of course it is not a Government matter in any way, but I think it right that the House should know the reasons why the Board of Trade granted this Provisional Order. The points which have been raised could be easily settled by the Committee upstairs.

*MR. T. W. RUSSELL: No, it goes before the Unopposed Bills Committee.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS: That difficulty could easily be got over by suspension of Standing Orders, and then the local authorities of Dungannon could have a full and fair hearing. This company has for many years been supplying gas in Dungannon without any statutory powers whatever. It had, therefore, no power to break up the streets without the consent of the local authority. The Board of Trade sent down a Special Commissioner to inquire whether there were good grounds for the Order, and he reported in favour of it. Seeing that the parties have so nearly come to an agreement as to the terms of purchase, surely it would be well to let the matter be threshed out by a Committee upstairs. If the Order is thrown out, matters, as far as the supply of gas is concerned, will be at a deadlock.

*MR. T. W. RUSSELL: No, no!

MR. DILLON: The company and the town will be left in exactly the position they have occupied for the last ten years.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS: In case of accident they will be unable to touch a main or pipe, unless the local authority consents. There has been no friction for the last ten years; the company and the local authority have been able to work together. But will they be able to do so in the future? I think it will be better for both the local authority and the Council that this Order should be sent to a Committee upstairs, for that is the only tribunal which can properly settle the points in dispute.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. MACARTNEY, Antrim, S.): I propose to vote against this Order. The arguments of the right hon. Gentleman have made no impression on me. No one will be damnified if the Order is lost, for matters will remain in precisely the same position as prior to its introduction, while between now and next year there will be ample opportunity for settling the question in dispute as to the value of the undertaking. I hope, therefore, the House will reject the Order.

Question put, and negatived.

Words added.

Main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to. Second Reading put off for three months.

PRIVATE BILLS [Lords] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the

case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz. :—

Bournemouth Corporation Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.

ASTON MANOR TRAMWAYS BILL [Lords].

Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

GREAT GRIMSBY STREET TRAMWAYS BILL [Lords].

MARGATE PIER AND HARBOUR BILL [Lords].

MERSEY RAILWAY BILL [Lords].

RAWMARSH URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL (TRAMWAYS) BILL [Lords].

As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

EDINBURGH CORPORATION BILL [Lords]. (BY ORDER.)

As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time.

NORTH METROPOLITAN ELECTRIC POWER SUPPLY BILL. (BY ORDER.)

Ordered, That in the case of the North Metropolitan Electric Power Supply Bill, Standing Order 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time."—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed.

TRAMWAYS ORDERS CONFIRMATION (No. 2) BILL [Lords].

Read a second time, and committed.

RAMSGATE CORPORATION IMPROVEMENTS BILL [Lords].

Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 7) BILL [Lords].

Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time to-morrow.

HAMMOND (G. H.) COMPANY BILL [Lords].

Reported, without Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time.

LONDON AND SAN FRANCISCO BANK BILL [Lords].

Reported, without Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time.

NORTH BRITISH RAILWAY BILL [Lords].

DUBLIN, WICKLOW, AND WEXFORD RAILWAY BILL [Lords].

SOUTH SHIELDS CORPORATION BILL [Lords].

Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Belfast and County Down Railway Bill, with an Amendment.

That they have agreed to—Jarrow and Hebburn Electricity Supply Bill and Hastings Tramways Bill, with Amendments.

That they have agreed to Amendments to—Donegal Railway Bill [Lords] and Great Southern and Western Railway Bill [Lords], without amendment.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Inverness, against; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (No. 2) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Carlton; South Shields (two); Staithes; Loftus; and Bradford; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

MEDICAL AND SANITARY ARRANGEMENTS AT THE CAPE.

Return [presented 16th July] to be printed. [No. 279.]

CAPE COLONY.

Copy presented, of Correspondence relating to Affairs of the Cape Colony [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

CIVIL SERVICES (SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1900-1901).

Estimate presented, of the further sums required to be voted for the service of the year ending 31st March, 1901 [by Command]; Referred to the Committee of Supply, and to be printed. [No. 280.]

TRAMWAYS ORDERS CONFIRMATION (No. 3) BILL.

Copy ordered, "of Memorandum stating the nature of the Proposals contained in the Provisional Orders included in the Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 3) Bill."—(*Mr. Ritchie.*)

BANKRUPTCY (IRELAND).

Return ordered, "of Bankruptcy Cases closed by each of the Official Assignees in Ireland for the year ended the 31st day of December, 1899, showing—

1. Number of cases.	2. Class. Gross assets.	3. Gross receipts.	4. Payments to secured creditors.	5. Preferential payments for rents, taxes, salaries, and allowance to Bankrupt.	6. Legal and other charges.	7. Remuneration to Official Assignee.	8. Dividends.	9. Balance.	Bankrupt's Statement. 10. Assets.	Bankrupt's Statement. 11. Liabilities.	12. Amount of proofs admitted.

—(*Mr. Field.*)

QUESTIONS.

CHINA—ANTI-FOREIGN OUTBREAK—RECENT NEWS.

SIR HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he has any news from China to communicate to the House.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): We have received no information in the last twenty-four hours either from the Consul at Tientsin or from the Commanding Officer, nor have we received any information from Shanghai of the reports which have reached that city of attacks on Tientsin by the allies. I see there are reports both ways, one of failure and the more recent one of successful attack.

MR. PRITCHARD MORGAN (Merthyr Tydvil): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the British Legation at Peking was standing on the 9th inst.?

MR. BRODRICK: The hon. Member has given me no notice of the question, but we have no confirmation of the statement.

MR. PRITCHARD MORGAN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware of the fact that His Excellency Li Hung Chang left Canton this morning for Peking with the view of taking supreme command in China?

[The question was not answered.]

DESPATCH OF INDIAN TROOPS TO CHINA.

MR. MACLEAN (Cardiff): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether the force of British and Native troops under orders for China has been again increased. What is now the total strength of the withdrawals from the Indian Establishment for service abroad, and whether the Viceroy is satisfied that all these troops can be spared. And whether the present Acting Commander-in-Chief in India is a member of the Viceroy's executive council, which issues orders for the despatch of troops on foreign service.

The following question on the same subject also appeared on the Paper:—

MR. BUCHANAN (Aberdeenshire, E.): To ask the Secretary of State for

India whether it is intended to despatch from India additional British and Native regiments for service in China, and what steps are being taken to supply the place of these and the other forces now serving out of India.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord G. HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): Since I last replied to the hon. Member's enquiries on the subject (21st and 26th June)† it has been decided to increase the strength of the force proceeding from India to China by about 6,000 men, which, with the exception of two batteries of artillery, is entirely drawn from the Native Army. This raises the total number of troops withdrawn from the Indian Establishment for service in China and elsewhere to about 22,000. These movements have the full concurrence of the Viceroy. The provisional Commander-in-Chief in India is not a member of the Viceroy's executive council, but he is the adviser of the Viceroy on military questions.

MR. BUCHANAN. Then there is no truth in the statement that no British regiments are included in the division.

LORD G. HAMILTON: It is a mere newspaper rumour.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): Upon which exchequer will the cost fall—the Imperial or the Indian?

*MR. SPEAKER: Notice must be given of that question.

THE YANG-TSZE CABLE.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer what financial arrangement has been made with regard to the strategic cable about to be laid from the Island of Gutzlaff, at the mouth of the south channel of the Yang-tsze, to the north; and whether, having regard to the fact that the island is the landing-place of the cables of the Danish Great Northern Telegraph Company running to Nagasaki and Vladivostock, it is arranged that the offices at the end of the new line will be in British hands, and distinct from the offices in which foreign clerks are employed.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): The proposed cable to Wei-hai-wei is not to be laid from Gutzlaff but from the Saddle Islands, which are some thirty miles further seawards. The Great Northern Company has no station on these islands. Arrangements will be made for the working of the new cable by a British staff. Negotiations are in progress with the Eastern Extension Telegraph Company as to the ownership of the cable. Pending the result, the company will lay and work the line.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—COMPENSATION TO LOYALISTS IN NATAL.

SIR ANDREW SCOBLE (Hackney, Central): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether it is intended to compensate loyal residents in Natal for the injury done to their property during the recent Boer occupation; whether any steps have been taken to ascertain the amount of compensation due to such residents; whether prompt payment will be made to those whose claims are established; and whether such compensation will be paid out of the funds of the colony; and whether it is proposed to make any grant from Imperial funds in order to secure that immediate and adequate compensation may be afforded in all proper cases.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): Her Majesty's Government have pledged themselves to exact compensation for loyal residents for direct losses. A Commission was appointed by the Governor in December last to make inquiry as to direct losses in invaded districts, and is still engaged in its task. The Colonial Government have undertaken to advance compensation to an amount not exceeding 75 per cent. of the valuation as assessed by the Commission in cases where it can be proved that claimants are in urgent need of financial assistance. Compensation will to this extent be advanced out of Colonial funds, on the understanding that ultimately compensation will be paid out of the indemnity to be exacted from the Orange River Colony and the Transvaal. No grant from Imperial funds is contemplated in these circumstances.

† See *The Parliamentary Debates* [Fourth Series], Vol. lxxxiv., p p. 626 and 1122.

MARTIAL LAW—ADMINISTRATION.

MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN (Montgomeryshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether there are in any civil prison in the Cape Colony any, and, if any, how many persons detained by sentences of courts martial.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I have no information, I am sorry to say; but if the hon. Gentleman desires, I will communicate with Sir Alfred Milner. It will, however, take some time.

MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN: I think it would be interesting to have the information.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Why not communicate by telegraph?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Sir Alfred Milner is already subjected to tremendous strain, and I do not like to add to the pressure unnecessarily. I will communicate by despatch, however.

COURTS-MARTIAL SENTENCES.

MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether persons sentenced by courts-martial in the Cape Colony to terms of imprisonment or penal servitude are detained in civil or in military prisons; and, if they are detained in civil prisons, whether the warrants are signed by civil or by military officers.

*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): The records of proceedings under martial law have not reached this country. I understand, however, that, except for minor breaches of military regulations, there have been very few cases finally decided by military courts. No sentence of penal servitude has been confirmed. I presume that the warrants are signed by the presiding officer, and that the prisoner after sentence is confined in some suitable place within the limits of the area over which martial law has been proclaimed.

MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN: In civil or military custody?

*MR. WYNDHAM: I should say in military custody.

HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL ARRANGEMENTS—COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I promised to announce at the earliest opportunity the additional names for the Commission to inquire into the arrangements for the sick and wounded in South Africa. I am glad to say we have obtained the services of Sir David Richmond, ex-Lord Provost of Glasgow, a respected gentleman and deeply versed in administrative affairs, and Mr. Harrison, general manager of the London and North-Western Railway. I am particularly glad we have got Mr. Harrison to serve, seeing that questions of transport are clearly of great importance, and his name will, I think, carry universal weight with all acquainted with railway management.

MR. BURDETT-COUTTS (Westminster): Will the right hon. Gentleman give us any opportunity of discussing these names or the constitution of the Committee of Inquiry?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No, Sir.

MR. BURDETT-COUTTS: Then I beg to ask leave to move the adjournment of the House in order to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance—namely, the constitution and scope of the Committee of Inquiry.

*MR. SPEAKER: It is somewhat difficult to remember the exact course of events, but I believe I am right in saying that a motion for the adjournment of the House was made on 5th July by the hon. Member for Northampton, in order to discuss the composition and scope of reference of the Committee appointed to inquire into the treatment of the sick and wounded in South Africa.† On that motion a discussion took place upon scope of reference and the three names then placed before the House. I do not think that a renewed discussion upon those three names would be in order. It is a well-known rule that the same matter cannot be discussed twice on a motion of adjournment under Standing Order 17. But as regards the two new names now added, it will lie with the House and not with

† See preceding volume of *Debates*, page 648.

me to say whether they shall discuss them or not. If the hon. Member cares to alter his motion in this way—namely, to discuss the nomination of Sir D. Richmond and Mr. Harrison as members of the Committee of Inquiry, such a motion would be in order.

MR. BURDETT-COUTTS: May I respectfully remind you, Sir, that on the occasion referred to I stated that I had an objection to one of the names, but no discussion of that objection or name took place. The discussion took a wider scope, and had reference to the large element of the medical profession on the Commission. I now propose to deal with an entirely new matter.

*MR. SPEAKER: I look at the subject-matter proposed for discussion; I have really nothing to do with the particular arguments that have been used. The matter proposed for discussion was the composition and scope of reference of the Committee appointed to inquire into the treatment of sick and wounded soldiers, it being proposed that the Committee should consist of a certain learned judge and two members of the medical profession. The question of the composition of the Committee so far as those three gentlemen were concerned was open and was discussed. I think it would be quite contrary to the rules of the House, especially in a matter of such a personal bearing, if three names which were discussed by the House on one occasion were re-discussed on a motion for the adjournment without any alteration of the circumstances with regard to those three names.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: With all respect, I submit that new circumstances have since arisen with respect to Professor Cunningham. I am in the recollection of the House when I say that the First Lord on the last occasion threatened to withdraw his name if there was any discussion on it.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I never said anything of the kind.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Since then the charge has been openly made that Professor Cunningham has been recommended by those who are interested in the issue of the inquiry.

*MR. SPEAKER: The names were before the House. It is almost inevitable that some further arguments should have occurred to some hon. Members' minds, but that does not alter the fact that this matter has been discussed by the House under Standing Order 17 as regards those three gentlemen. The other two names can be discussed if the hon. Member wishes.

MR. BURDETT-COUTTS: The First Lord of the Treasury stated in definite terms that neither of the two medical gentlemen had any connection with the Army Medical Department. Subsequently it became known that one of those gentlemen held a paid appointment in connection with the Army Medical Department.

*MR. SPEAKER: I am quite sure that the whole matter was open to discussion, though, of course, it is impossible to say of every hon. Member that everything was present in his mind then which is present in his mind now. I must adhere to what I have said, that if the hon. Member asks leave to move the adjournment in order to discuss two names now for the first time before the House, that is a matter which I am prepared to submit to the House.

MR. BURDETT-COUTTS: As your ruling makes it impossible for me to bring before the House new matter of great interest, I must beg leave to withdraw.

PRETORIA—ATTEMPT TO BLOW UP MAGAZINE.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether he has any information to the effect that Lieutenant Tossel, of the Transvaal Police, and Mr. Solomon Gillingham have been condemned to death in Pretoria for alleged complicity to blow up the magazine; and whether he can say if Mr. Gillingham holds military rank in the Republican Army or what is his occupation, and when the trial took place, before what tribunal, what was the evidence of guilt, and when the sentence is to be carried into effect.

*MR. WYNDHAM: There is no information at the War Office in regard to the matters referred to in the question.

ROYAL ARTILLERY—SECOND LIEUTENANTS.

MR. BARTLEY (Islington, N.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that many second lieutenants in the Royal Artillery, who have had two years training at Woolwich and have served nearly three years in the artillery, are not allowed to receive the full rank of lieutenant, while those now joining the artillery direct from school with no training at Woolwich, will be made full lieutenants in three years; and whether steps will be taken at once to remedy this state of things.

*MR. WYNDHAM: Time spent at the Royal Military Academy, Woolwich, is not permitted to reckon as Army service. The Secretary of State for War sees no reason for making any alteration in this respect.

LINE BATTALIONS—BAND AND MESS EXPENSES.

MR. RENTOUL (Down, E.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether he will state, in the case of the new Line battalions now being raised, what are the approximate total expenses of supplying the band with instruments and furnishing and equipping the mess with necessaries; whether these expenses have to be borne by the officers of each new battalion, or does the Government defray them or make any contribution towards them; and if any contribution is made by Government, what is its amount.

*MR. WYNDHAM: The cost varies in different regiments, but is believed to amount, on the average, to about £1,000. The contribution from the Government is £500. The question whether this contribution should be increased is under consideration.

MILITIA—FURLOUGH PAY.

SIR JOHN DORINGTON (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether men of the embodied Militia proceeding on furlough have their pay stopped, whilst men of the Regular forces proceeding on furlough continue to draw their pay; and, if so, whether there is any reason for this difference of treatment.

*MR. WYNDHAM: The rule has been as stated by the hon. Member, because the case contemplated was that of a Militiaman sent on furlough as soon as he joined, and therefore not disturbed in his civil occupation. But furlough with pay is now granted to Militiamen belonging to corps which have been some time embodied.

NAVY—CORDITE POWDER—EROSION OF GUNS.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether the erosion of Naval guns by cordite is now being considered by a Committee; and, if so, of whom that Committee consists.

*MR. WYNDHAM: Yes, Sir. The Committee consists of Lord Rayleigh (president), Sir W. Roberts-Austen, Sir W. Crookes, Sir Andrew Noble, and Mr. R. P. Haldane, M.P.

MR. PAULTON (Durham, Bishop Auckland): Will this Committee have special regard to the erosion of guns on active service in South Africa?

*MR. WYNDHAM: I have not the terms of reference before me, but I should say that the effect on guns in South Africa will be considered by them.

PICRIC ACID.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether the plant for the manufacture of picric acid in this country is considered by the Admiralty to be sufficient to meet the strain of naval war, and whether any steps are being taken to increase it.

*MR. WYNDHAM: I think this is a question that I should answer. The plant in this country is now sufficient to meet the needs of both services, and to provide for the accumulation of large reserves; but in order to meet needs even in excess of that standard, steps are being continually taken to increase the available plant; three new factories have recently been started.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: But is it not the case that picric acid cannot be kept in reserve?

*MR. WYNDHAM: I imagine it can be kept for some time, or the word "reserves" would not be used.

ADMIRALTY COAL CONTRACTS.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydfil): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty, in view of his statement that it was proposed before the next emergency coal contracts were made to revise some of the conditions, if he can state what alterations were made in the conditions of the contracts recently entered into by the Admiralty.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. MACARTNEY, Antrim, S.): No alterations were made in the emergency coal contracts recently entered into, as it was not considered desirable at the present juncture to vary the conditions.

MR. D. A. THOMAS: But did not the First Lord promise to alter the contracts?

MR. MACARTNEY: He promised to consider the point. He did so, and it was not deemed desirable to make the alteration at the present juncture.

BELLEVILLE BOILERS—ADMIRALTY TESTS.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he has considered the statement at page 6 of the Memorandum respecting water-tube boilers, that in the manœuvres of 1899 the Belleville-boiler ship "Europa" made good her defects with her own resources, and that all four Belleville-boiler ships "Europa," "Argonaut," "Gladiator," and "Vindictive," maintained a speed of seventeen knots except during fogs; and does this statement agree with the report of Admiral Domvile respecting the behaviour of these ships during the manœuvres in question; were Fleet artificers other than her own employed in remedying defects on board the "Europa" during these manœuvres; and if so, how many and for how long; and did Admiral Domvile report as to the "Europa" that even after the repairs had been made she could not steam eleven knots, and did he make a similar report as to the "Argonaut"; if not, what did he report as to the speed of these ships during the manœuvres of 1899.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. GOSCHEN, St. George's, Hanover Square): Admiral Domvile's report with regard to the "Europa's" defects during the manœuvres of 1899 was as follows—

"On the 18th July, during the preliminary cruise, the captain of the 'Argonaut' reported that, owing to leakage and loss of water caused by fractured pipes and leaky boiler doors, the ship was unable to steam at full speed, or even more than ten knots. The 'Europa' was in a minor degree the same. On arrival at Milford thirty-one artificers of the Fleet were employed in remaking joints, etc., of the 'Argonaut,' the 'Europa' making good her defects with her own artificers."

In the captain of "Europa's" report it is stated the boilers worked very satisfactorily, without any hitch, no doors of boiler tubes giving out. Admiral Domvile did not report that the "Europa" could not steam eleven knots after repairs. No further report on the speed of the "Argonaut" was made than that given above.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY (Yorkshire, W.R., Shipley): How long did the repairs to the "Argonaut" occupy?

MR. GOSCHEN: I cannot say from memory, but it was a very short time.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I understand from the answer to the second paragraph that the "Europa" only employed her own artificers to remedy the defects.

MR. GOSCHEN: Yes; her own.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he can explain the statement at page 6 of the Memorandum on Water-tube Boilers, that the Belleville boiler ships "Europa," "Argonaut," and "Vindictive," maintained a speed of 17 knots, except during fogs, by stating the number of hours during which that speed was actually maintained by them, and the number of hours during which the fogs necessitated a lesser rate of speed, and what that lesser rate was; and whether, in view of the fact that in their trials the "Europa" attained a speed of 20·4 knots, the "Argonaut" a speed of 21·16 knots, and the "Vindictive" a speed of 20·1 knots, the attainment by these ships of 17 knots satisfies the Admiralty requirements.

MR. GOSCHEN: The portions of the report of the captain of the "Europa,"

who was senior officer of the cruiser squadron, dealing with the question of speed, are as follows—

"I proceeded to sea for convoy in Her Majesty's ship under my command with 'Argonaut,' 'Gladiator,' 'Vindictive,' 'St. George,' 'Diana,' and 'Sappho,' at five a.m. on the 30th July.

"Proceeding at 17 knots 'Sappho' soon began to drop, complaining of priming. She was sent back to join your flag.

"We had to ease to 12 knots in the afternoon, as the 'Argonaut' had an indicator-pipe started; soon after, at 5.38 p.m., we ran into a heavy fog. This necessitated easing to 10 knots, and again to 8 knots for a short time, as the ships were inclined to separate; emerging at 7.48 p.m., speed was worked up to 17 knots until 1.8 a.m., when another dense fog was run into, decreasing from 17 to 10 knots. The positions of ships were well maintained, with the exception of 'Gladiator.' Emerging at 2.58 a.m., speed was increased to 17 knots, and maintained right through until meeting the convoy at 5.33 p.m. on 31st July."

The speed of 17 knots is a good one for a squadron of six cruisers to maintain, and was no doubt determined by the Admiral's orders, having regard to their coal supply, and the nature of the operations. The Admiral would naturally not order them to go at the maximum speed of the fastest ship, except in chase.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I suppose I may assume that 17 knots satisfies the Admiralty requirements?

MR. GOSCHEN: Generally speaking 17 knots is a high speed for a cruising squadron.

BELLEVILLE BOILERS—USE IN THE MERCANTILE MARINE.

MR. DAVID MACIVER (Liverpool, Kirkdale): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that the use of Belleville boilers has in this country been entirely discarded in the steamers of the mercantile marine; and, if not, can he give the names of any British trading steamers which are so fitted.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. JESSE COLLINGS, Birmingham, Bordesley) (for Mr. RITCHIE): The Board of Trade are not aware of any vessel in the British mercantile marine that is fitted with Belleville boilers.

ASHANTI—NATIVE RISING—RELIEF OF COOMASSIE.

MR. DRAGE (Derby): Has the Secretary of State for the Colonies any news from Coomassie?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I have received the following telegram from the Commandant at the Base at Cape Coast—

"Cape Coast, 17th July. — Apparently authentic information just received from Bekwai by messenger to Fumsu that Coomassie gave night signals: Relieved on 15th July."

This is the date on which Colonel Willcocks expected to carry out that relief. If the news is true, as I believe it is, I think it reflects the greatest credit on Colonel Willcocks and the forces under his command, who have been fighting under the most terrible conditions of climate and season.

INDIA—EDUCATION.

SIR MANCHERJEE BHOWNAGGREE (Bethnal Green, N.E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India if he will state the present number of technical, industrial, and Art schools or classes in India; the annual expenditure incurred by Government in maintaining the same; and what proportion such number and expenditure bear to those of colleges and schools of general education.

LORD G. HAMILTON: My hon. friend will find such figures as can be given, with a very full discussion of their bearing and effect in pages 248 to 281 of Mr. J. S. Cotton's Report on the progress of Education in India, 1892-93 to 1895-97, which was presented to Parliament in 1898. There may have been some progress since 1897, but I apprehend that the pressure of famine and plague in a large part of India has not admitted of increased expenditure on this object as a whole. My hon. friend will see from Mr. Cotton's remarks that it is not possible on the figures available to give separately the number and cost even of wholly technical institutions, inasmuch as many of the technical schools are grouped in the returns with other schools under the head of "Special Schools." As regards classes, the report shows that in every province attention is paid to the teaching of practical subjects, which may be described as preparatory technical in-

struction, in both primary and secondary schools. It is not, however, possible to show separately the expenditure in teaching these subjects, or the number of pupils attending the classes.

JAMAICA RAILWAY DEBENTURES—INCOME TAX.

MR. BARTLEY: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether any decision has been come to to refund the additional income tax charged at the rate of 1s. in the £ on the overdue interest on the debentures of the Jamaica Railway for the years 1897, 1898, and 1899, which was paid out of money supplied by Parliament last year, but the payment of which was withheld till May last.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I have no doubt, after inquiry from the Commissioners of Inland Revenue, that the income tax of 1s. in the £ was legally charged in this case. The only ground, therefore, on which a claim for relief could be sustained is that suggested in the question that the payment of the interest was due while the income tax stood at 8d. in the £, and was delayed by the fault of the Colonial Government. I have ascertained from the Colonial Office that, under the arrangement made with the trustees of the bondholders, the latter did not become entitled to the payment of the arrears of interest and to the issue of inscribed stock in exchange for their bonds until the final decree of the Supreme Court of Jamaica in the matter was made—namely, on the 11th April, 1900—when the income tax stood at 1s. in the £, and that the Executive Government of Jamaica cannot be held in any way responsible for the delay, if any, in the issue of the decree. I do not, therefore, see any sufficient grounds for submitting a Vote to Parliament to defray the cost of the remissions desired, which would be the only legal mode of affording relief.

INCOME TAX DEDUCTIONS.

MR. MACLEAN: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the Government has authorised the Bank of England to deduct income tax at the rate of 1s. in the £ from coupons or interest warrants maturing on or about the 1st of July instant, and whether the tax should not be levied at the rate of 8d. in the £ for interest which accrued during the first quarter of the year, and 1s. in the £ for the second quarter, or an average rate of 10d. in the £ instead of 1s.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: Dividends and interest from the public funds, from foreign or colonial loans, or foreign or colonial companies, and interest paid by local authorities to creditors on rates, are by law chargeable with income tax at the rate in force at the time when they become payable in this country, without regard to the period during which they have accrued. The Bank of England have been so informed by the Board of Inland Revenue, and are under obligation to deduct income tax accordingly. In other cases, such as mortgage interest and ground rents and the profits of public companies in the United Kingdom, income tax is deducted at an average rate based on the rates in force during the period in which the income taxed has been accruing, and if, in any such cases, the business of deducting the income tax is conducted by the Bank of England, this principle would be followed.

WILLESDEN POOR LAW CHILDREN—RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION.

MR. TALBOT (Oxford University): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been called to the proceedings of the Willesden Board of Guardians on the 20th June last, during which it appears that the guardians made no appointment of a chaplain for Rockhall and Rochford House, but, instead, made arrangements with the ministers of various denomina- to give religious instruction to the children under their charge in those establishments; whether the whole of these children are entered on the creed register as belonging to the Church of England; and, if so, whether this arrangement is in accordance with the regulation which requires that children in poor-law establisdments should be brought up in the faith of their parents; and whether he proposes to take any action to remedy this state of things.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. CHAPLIN, Lincolnshire, Sleaford): I have made inquiry on this subject, and I am informed that owing to the temporary nature of the institutions referred to and also to the small number of inmates, the guardians

were of opinion that the appointment of a chaplain is not requisite, but that arrangements could be made for voluntary religious instruction being given to the inmates. The clerk states that in preparing a rota of ministers he has taken into consideration the fact that the majority of the inmates are described as Church of England, and that he has accordingly arranged with the vicar of the parish for the attendance at the two institutions of a minister of the Church of England at least once in each week. Rochford House only is provided as a home for children, and the regulations which the guardians have drawn up provide that the children shall attend divine service every Sunday at such places of worship in the neighbourhood as may be in conformity with the religious persuasion of the children. They also provide that no child under the age of twelve shall be permitted to receive religious instruction at variance with the creed under which he is registered in the creed register.

MR. TALBOT: Will the right hon. Gentleman take care that this temporary arrangement is not made permanent?

MR. CHAPLIN: I will make it my business to use my influence to prevent that.

DUKINFIELD POSTMASTERSHIP.

MR. M'GHEE (Louth, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he can state the number of applicants for the postmastership of Dukinfield; and whether the questions of seniority and ability were considered before making the appointment.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. HANBURY, Preston): The number of applicants was 112. The answer to the second paragraph of the question is in the affirmative.

LIVERPOOL TELEGRAPHISTS—PROMOTIONS.

MR. M'GHEE: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that a telegraphist at the Liverpool Post Office, number 34 on the seniority list, has been promoted recently to the class of clerks; whether the men who were passed over received any notice of the impending promotion; and can he state the reasons for their non-advancement, and for what special circumstances the junior officer was selected.

MR. HANBURY: A sorting clerk and telegraphist, standing number 34 of his class at Liverpool, has lately been promoted to fill a vacant clerkship. The officers who were passed over did not receive notice that the promotion was under consideration. It is not the practice to issue any such notice, nor is it necessary to take such a course in order to ensure that the claims of all the men concerned receive proper consideration. The officer promoted was selected for the vacant post because he was held by the Postmaster General, after careful inquiry, to be the best qualified to perform the duties to be taken up.

HISTORICAL MANUSCRIPTS COMMISSION.

SIR HENRY FOWLER: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he will lay upon the Table of the House a copy of the document which he described as the Queen's authority to the Historical Manuscripts Commissioners, which restricts their operations to manuscripts belonging to private persons; and whether the Trustees of the British Museum have taken any steps for the printing of any historical manuscripts acquired by them.

MR. HANBURY: I do not propose to lay the document formally upon the Table, but I shall be glad to show the right hon. Member a copy. It authorises and appoints certain Commissioners "to make inquiry into the places in which documents illustrative of history or of general public interest belonging to private owners are deposited." The British Museum only print and publish a few exceptional documents, but they regularly publish catalogues and indexes of all MSS. A forthcoming volume will include the Hardwicke papers, which were only bought in 1899 and were then in a state of chaos. Even while the MSS. are being sorted they are open to the inspection of scholars—and, of course, when sorted and catalogued they are open to the general reader. The catalogues and indexes are published and sold to the public.

JURY SERVICE—EXEMPTIONS—PAYMENT.

MR. BILLSON (Halifax): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he will instruct sheriffs and coroners and their subordinates to omit from the list of persons liable to be summoned as jurymen all persons who have previously been excused from service on juries by reason of deafness or other physical defects; and whether it is the intention of the Government to bring in a Bill to remunerate common as well as grand jurymen.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS (for Sir M. WHITE RIDLEY): The Secretary of State has no authority to issue instructions of the nature indicated. The answer to the second paragraph is in the negative.

PRIVATE BILL LEGISLATION—COST—RETURN.

MR. D. A. THOMAS: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he can state when the Return relating to the expenses incurred in Private Bill Legislation ordered by the House on 28th April, 1899, is likely to be presented; and whether, having regard to the delay in its presentation, the information sought can be given to the end of last session.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS (for Sir M. WHITE RIDLEY): There has been no undue delay in presenting this Return, considering the great labour and difficulties involved in communicating with 1,389 separate local authorities, and 1,050 companies. Even as it is, the Board of Trade have failed to obtain any figures from a considerable number of companies, and have been obliged to make up their part of the Return (with which they have only just been able to supply me) without them. The printing of this part of the Return will be proceeded with as speedily as possible; the rest of it is practically ready. To bring the Return down to the end of last session would involve a further long postponement. I told my hon. friend at the time the Return was granted that it would take a considerable time to prepare it.

VICTORIA AND ALBERT MUSEUM—ASSISTANTSHIPS.

MR. W. F. D. SMITH (Westminster): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether candidates for the forthcoming examination for assistantships in the Victoria and Albert Museum are being selected by nomination; and, whether the system of nomination has been recently substituted for that of open competition; and, if so, can he say for what reason the change has been made.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL ON EDUCATION (Sir J. GORST, Cambridge University): Assistants in the Victoria and Albert Museum are a new class, and are to be filled up by limited competition, as is done in a similar class in the British Museum.

BOARDING OUT OF PAUPER CHILDREN.

MR. LAWRENCE (Liverpool, Abercromby): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education what decision has been come to by the Committee of Council on Education with reference to the protest made to the President of such Council by the Executive Council of the Association of Poor Law Unions against the regulation contained in the boarding-out regulations made by the Committee under the Elementary Education (Defective and Epileptic Children) Act, 1899, that no child within that Act shall be boarded out in a home in which any poor-law child is boarded out by a board of guardians; and whether such regulation will be withdrawn, thereby removing any slur upon poor-law children.

SIR J. GORST: No slur upon poor-law children is either intended or conveyed by the regulation; but it is thought inexpedient for two separate and distinct Government authorities to have jurisdiction in the same home.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND)—FEE GRANT.

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether his attention has been called to the fact that, in 1897, when allocating the money which should be given to Scotland as against that given to England in the matter of the Voluntary schools, the Scotch Office had estimated that a sum of £26,000 annually from Imperial funds would be required to maintain the Scotch fee grant at 12s.

per scholar, which he had agreed to pay as part payment of the equivalent to Scotland; whether he is aware that for the four financial years ending 31st March, 1901, the amounts paid or estimated as requiring to be paid in respect of the above undertaking, instead of amounting to £104,000, amount only to about £5,000; and whether he will reconsider this payment to Scotland.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: The answer to the first two paragraphs of the question is in the affirmative; but this matter has not been dealt with on the basis of equivalent grants since a fee grant of 10s. per child throughout the United Kingdom was substituted for the equivalent grant system in 1897. Up to that time the Scotch Education Department had paid a fee grant not of 10s. but of 12s. per child, partly out of an Exchequer grant, and partly out of the residue of the Local Taxation Fund. It was thought that this fund could no longer make up the amount necessary to provide the additional 2s., and as part of the additional aid given to Education in Scotland in 1897 we undertook that if it failed any deficiency should be made up from the Exchequer, to an extent which was estimated by the Scotch Office at £26,000 as a maximum, but by the Opposition at no more than £18,000. Since that time, however, the continued productiveness of the share of the Death Duties which goes to the Scotch Local Taxation Fund has enabled that fund to bear the cost of the additional 2s. fee grant to Scotland, and so the anticipated contribution from the Exchequer has not been required. I certainly cannot accept the view that we agreed to pay this £26,000, whether it was required or not—but the fact that it has not been required might, I think, be taken into account to some extent in considering the proposals for further expenditure on Scottish Education that may be brought before me.

DUBLIN LAND COMMISSION—THE ULSTER CUSTOM.

MR. SAMUEL YOUNG (Cavan, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the case of Lindsay, tenant, and Mrs. Corry, landlord, decided by Mr. Justice Meredith at the Land Commission Court at Dublin on Tuesday last, when a decision was come to the effect of which would be to make a sale on such an estate dependent on the Irish Land Act of 1881, and not on the Ulster custom, as has hitherto been believed to be the right of the Ulster tenant; and whether he will consider the advisability of amending the Irish Land Laws, so as to prevent the Ulster tenants from being deprived of the right of free sale under the Ulster custom.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. G. W. BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): The hon. Member misapprehends the facts. The sale was held to be a sale under the Ulster custom, one of the incidents of which is that the landlord should consent to the transaction to make it valid. In this case this consent had not been given, and the purchaser was accordingly decided not to be a tenant entitled to have his rent fixed. The decision upholds the custom, and no legislation is necessary.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—INSPECTOR GENERAL.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state what are the special qualifications of Colonel Neville Chamberlain for appointment to the post of Inspector General of the Royal Irish Constabulary; what previous experience (if any) he has of police duties and police administration; and on whose recommendation was he appointed Inspector General.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: In reply to the first two paragraphs of this question I have nothing to add to what I said in answer to the hon. Member yesterday, except that it has been the rule, and not the exception, since the post of Inspector General was created in 1836, to appoint military men to the position. With respect to the last paragraph, the Lord Lieutenant, of course, satisfied himself of Colonel Chamberlain's suitability for the post, but any recommendations he received must be treated as confidential.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: What previous experience had he had of police duties?

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: No direct experience.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.E.): Is service in India or South Africa considered a qualification for controlling the Irish police?

MR. FLAVIN: Does he know how to put on a constabulary uniform?

DOWNPATRICK POSTMASTERSHIP.

MR. RENTOUL: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that in recently appointing a postmaster for Rathfriland the appointment was given to a person residing in Downpatrick Street; and whether, seeing that that is an inconvenient locality for the post office, and that there were four applicants for the position whose houses are in the square where the chief business of the town is transacted, he can state the reasons for locating the post office in any other place than the square.

MR. HANBURY: The Postmaster General was aware of the situation of the present sub-postmaster's premises when appointing him sub-postmaster of Rathfriland. He was considered to be the best qualified of the candidates, and was able to devote the whole of his time to the service of the Department, and this was regarded as more than counterbalancing any inconvenience that might be occasioned by the removal of the office to Downpatrick Street. A memorial was received signed by many influential residents of Rathfriland in favour of the candidate who was selected.

CLONES LEVEL CROSSING.

MR. MACALEESE (Monaghan, N.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he can state when the Report promised upon the condition of the level crossing and of the island platform at Clones railway station, Great Northern Railway, Ireland, will be issued.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS: The Board of Trade have not yet received the Report, but they are pressing for it; and as soon as it is received they will communicate with the hon. Member.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. BUCHANAN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether any Supplementary Civil Service Estimates are to be introduced this session.

MR. HANBURY: Supplementary Estimates will be presented for Colonial Services (Ashanti); for a contribution to the Local Taxation (Ireland) Account in respect of Pauper Lunatics; for Civil Contingencies; and possibly for expenditure in connection with Private Bill Procedure in Scotland.

SIR HENRY FOWLER: What will be the business to-morrow?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: As regards the business for to-morrow, we propose to take the Volunteers Bill as the first Order. I am afraid I cannot yet give any precise indication of the business for next week, except that the Indian Budget will be taken on Thursday of that week. It will, perhaps, be convenient if I state that on Thursday next and for the remainder of the session public business will begin at a quarter past three instead of half-past three of the clock.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT (1897) EXTENSION BILL.

Lords Amendment to be considered forthwith; considered, and agreed to.

COLONIAL STOCK BILL [Lords].

Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Thursday, and to be printed. [Bill 300.]

IMITATION OF COUNTY COURT PROCESS BILL [Lords].

Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Thursday, and to be printed. [Bill 301.]

REGISTRATION OF FIRMS BILL.

Special Report from the Select Committee on the Registration of Firms Bill, with Minutes of Evidence, brought up, and read.

Registration of Firms Bill reported, without Amendment.

Report and Special Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 281.]

COMPENSATION FOR DAMAGE TO CROPS BILL.

Order [this day] for resuming Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [21st March] read, and discharged; Bill withdrawn.

NEW BILLS.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT (1888) AMENDMENT (LONDON).

Bill to amend the Local Government Act, 1888, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Herbert Robertson, Sir Andrew Scoble, and Mr. Bousfield.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT (1888) AMENDMENT (LONDON) BILL.

"To amend the Local Government Act, 1888," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Thursday, 2nd August, and to be printed. [Bill 302.]

NAVAL RESERVE.

Bill to make further provision for a Naval Reserve, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Macartney, Mr. Goschen, and Mr. Attorney General.

NAVAL RESERVE BILL.

"To make further provision for a Naval Reserve," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 303.]

SUPPLY [19TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1900–1901 (including Supplementary Estimate).

1. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £6,739,000 (including an additional sum of £410,000), be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Expense of the Contract Work for Shipbuilding, Repairs, etc., which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901."

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. GOSCHEN, St. George's, Hanover Square): As some time has elapsed since the Navy Estimates were introduced I will make a few general observations on this Vote. I am afraid I may have to trouble the Committee at some length, and I hope they will be good enough to extend some indulgence to me, as I may have some little difficulty in making myself properly heard. Fair progress has been made since I last addressed the Committee in shipbuilding and in the delivery of armour and machinery. I cannot say that these deliveries are still up to our expectations and our hopes. There is, however, a great deal of improvement since last year in that respect. Armour has distinctly been delivered in larger quantities. Nevertheless, both as regards armour and the various materials that are necessary for shipbuilding, there is still a certain difficulty in getting all that is required in sufficient time. Many comments have been made on my statement with reference to the reasons why it was inadvisable to lay down more ships. I have a distinct policy in that respect. I should be extremely sorry if the laying down of more ships retarded the completion and the delivery of those that are already in hand. I should consider it undesirable to lay down a showy programme with a number of armoured ships and a number of cruisers with the necessary machinery, if by that I impaired to a certain extent the rapid completion of those that are now in hand. I am not sure that the Admiralty did not go rather too far before in laying down more ships at the time than those with which rapid progress could be made; and I wish the Committee thoroughly to grasp this—that it is not only the shipbuilder, it is not only the men in the dockyards who have to work to complete the ship, but we have to put the tube manufacturers into action, the manufacturers of gun mountings, of hydraulic machinery, and of a thousand accessories, and unless the deliveries of these accessories proceed *pari passu* with the completion of the hulls of the ships there is great waste. Scarcely in any single one of these respects have the contractors been able to keep their time. The House knows the many circumstances which affect in this way the completion of our ships. Shipbuilders do not make their own tubes, and contracts to deliver tubes have to be let to various contractors; nor do they make their own hydraulic machinery. If they are dependent on sub-contractors, then, if these sub-contractors were at once to assist the new ships, it would be at the expense of the delivery of the ships now in hand. For instance, if there were more armoured ships laid down, it would

be more difficult to get the armour which we now want for our ships; and we want armour for our ships in every direction. The public will scarcely realise the enormous number of ships that are building now for Her Majesty Government. Our programme is extremely large—larger than it has ever been at any time before. I am anxious that we should go on with that programme, laying down other ships so soon as we see that we have got a good prospect of making progress with them. Some firms have stated that they are willing to build ships at once, and we shall lay down new ships as soon as we see a prospect of making progress with them. Well, we have got to place six armoured cruisers under contract, and I am glad there will be such good competition for them as I gather from some of the statements currently made. Again, as regards the manufacture of machinery, it will be necessary to make machinery not only for these six armoured cruisers, but also for the two new battleships included in the programme. The Committee have observed from the Supplementary Estimate that where we have had the opportunity of purchasing some ships that were near completion we have availed ourselves of the option. In the Supplementary Estimate we take money to complete the purchase of five torpedo boat destroyers, which are almost ready, and which lay outside the programme that I submitted to the House. One of these is a very interesting vessel, a sister ship to the "Viper," embodying the turbine principle, which, so far as we are able at present to see, has been very successful. There will be further trials, but already speeds of thirty-six and thirty-four knots have been obtained. We have every hope that this new system of propelling will turn out a success. That is another argument for not having done what we are reproached in some quarters for not having done—namely, for not having laid down a number of new torpedo-boat destroyers. We want to see how this new system, which is especially adapted to torpedo-boat destroyers, will answer before we commence. We have every reason to suppose that in this new and most ingenious invention we shall find a fresh power which we shall have secured for this country, and in which for once, I think, this country will have a start over all other countries. I really do not know whether I ought to detain the House on a subject which has given rise to some questions and answers across the Table of this House and to some controversy in the newspapers. The controversy in the newspapers is a very onesided controversy, because while the administrator is attacked day by day he very seldom takes the opportunity to reply. I have again been charged—a charge which I thought I had entirely disposed of—with having neglected to spend all the money which has been placed at the disposal of the Admiralty by the House, and it is treated almost as a breach of trust. All the money in the dockyards has been spent in all these years. We have not been behindhand with our construction in the dockyards. It has been through the contractors, under Vote 3, that we have fallen behind. We cannot spend the money if the contractors do not produce the ships or the armour or the machinery for which we have to pay them. But if there is one body who must regret this delay, it is the Board of Admiralty, who are disappointed in their programme and have to show that what they hoped to be able to produce is not produced. The chief regret is ours, but we are powerless to help or to avoid it if the contractors do not earn the money. It must, however, be made good in subsequent years. Every year when the Estimates are being made up, if we have not spent the money placed at our disposal on shipbuilding, we have added the sum to the Estimates of the following year, so far as we knew the expenditure of the following year. I will take the first year for instance. Of the sum unexpended in that year £900,000 was re-voted in the following year, while the balance fell upon later years; because if you once fall behindhand the instalments must be spread over a greater number of years. All I can do is to assure the House that, in making up the Estimates, we have invariably added what was short-spent in one year to the Estimates of the coming year, and then taken a survey of the whole. Hon. Members can test that for themselves. If they take the "Canopus," or the "Ocean," or any of the later ships, they will find that the estimated expenditure placed against each ship in the three years or the four years is much larger than the total cost of the ship—that is to say, a part of the money is re-voted. It has not been our fault that we have not been able to spend the money,

but I cannot reiterate in too strong terms that we have always revoted the money and spread it over later years when we believed that the amount of money would be spent. I must apologise to the Committee for having gone into this matter. Many people might think it was wrong for me to argue with sandwichmen, but there are so many ways in which this has been spread by placards and by leaflets all over the country that I have been advised that it would be wise for me to contradict it once more—I hope once for all. There is another and still more absurd charge—namely, that the Admiralty have, out of deference to the Treasury, endeavoured to induce contractors to slacken the speed with which they were building their ships, and putting off the necessity for paying the instalments. I always wonder where such fancies can be hatched. I cannot imagine what can possibly be the ground for them. I am told it was suggested that I still retained some of my Chancellor of the Exchequer instincts, and that I was anxious to do a good turn to my right hon. friend the present Chancellor of the Exchequer by allowing him to have more money to pay off debt rather than spending it upon ships for which I am responsible. I need scarcely assure the House that it is too puerile, too absurd, to make such a suggestion as this. Far from it, in some cases we have given advances to contractors who were not yet entitled to them, to help them over some difficulty in order to be sure that we should not check the building of ships for whose delivery we are so anxious. I do not think there is a single person, in this House at all events, who would believe that any Admiralty would, in deference to any Department of the State, induce contractors to slacken the speed with which they can build ships. Certainly no such suggestion has ever been made to me while I have been at the head of the Admiralty. I have said enough now on the general progress which has been made with our shipbuilding, and I hope I do not take at all a pessimistic view. I believe that from month to month we shall now get on better, and that we shall find the deliveries on which we count coming in more punctually with every quarter. It will be a great satisfaction to me if, at the end of this year, I shall be able to show that we have spent, as I hope we shall spend, every shilling the House has placed at our disposal. The House may wish to know what type of battleships are to be the two which are to be laid down in the dockyards. They are to be of the "Formidable" and not of the "Canopus" type. Then, the new "Hermes" will be about a knot faster than the former "Hermes." I do not think the House will think it necessary that I should say anything about the smaller ships. They are of the same character as their predecessors. With reference to one very important question connected with shipbuilding, I will refer in one sentence to the experiments of the "Belleisle" and the question of the amount of wood which is to be put into our ships. Now, so far as the experiments on the "Belleisle" could prove that proper arrangements for flooding the decks and for taking every precaution against fire will have great success, so far I think the experiment has been distinctly successful. Attention is always called to the Spanish and Chinese ships, but on the Chinese and Spanish ships we have no evidence whatever that they had these fire services and all these precautions which are taken on board British men-of-war. In the case of the "Belleisle" the pumps continued to flood the deck during the whole of the bombardment, and were found to be quietly wetting the deck after a certain part of the ship had been destroyed. But I frankly say that I wish to guard the Admiralty against the impression that, because this experiment shows what it has shown, therefore we should be at all remiss in diminishing as far as we possibly can the employment of wood in all our battleships. What our critics do not quite realise is this: that, if there is to be a general reform carried out and that reform is carried out at once, it would involve taking an undue number of ships to pieces at possibly a very unfavourable and critical moment. When we are asked to reconstruct ships, what does it mean? It means that at a given time those ships must be put out of action for six months or a year, or for even a longer period. Therefore it has to be done with judgment, and we must watch the political situation of the day, lest we should be found improving ships just when ships are required, and instead of being ready at a critical moment we should find oursleves with ships stripped, and unable to be put into line.

SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) asked a question with regard to the use of non-inflammable wood.

MR. GOSCHEN: Non-inflammable wood is a different part of the question. We are putting non-inflammable wood into some of the ships we are building now, but the use of non-inflammable wood has not been entirely satisfactory, not as regards its non-inflammability, but as regards some of its other properties which make it rather difficult to employ it in certain parts of the ships. Great attention is being paid to the matter, but it must not be thought that the question can be solved by employing this particular wood without considerable further experience and experiment.

*SIR J. COLOMB (Great Yarmouth): Is it not true that the difficulty mostly experienced is with regard to painting?

MR. GOSCHEN: That is one difficulty; there are other defects. There are certain qualities in non-inflammable wood which, when it is brought into contact with screws and other ironwork which are required in fastening the wood, lead to corrosion. But this is not so simple a question as it may at first sight appear. Now I approach a topic which attracts a great deal of interest, one which is very technical indeed, and one with regard to which I should like to give some explanation and information to the House—namely, the very controverted question of water-tube boilers. Now, the experts in this House and those who are initiated in the matter will excuse me if on some points I seem to explain facts that are known to experts, but which may not be so well understood by the uninitiated. In the first instance, a great distinction is to be drawn between two classes of water-tube boilers—the small water-tube boilers and the large water-tube boilers. The large water-tube boiler is generally represented by the Belleville and Niclausse and some other types. The small water-tube boiler is represented by the Thornycroft, the Normand, the Yarrow, and others. These two classes resemble each other in some respects, and especially in this, that they are both applied to high pressure — very high pressure—in all the ships of the class of water-tube boilers. There is also a certain approximation between small water-tube boilers and large water-tube boilers. A water-tube boiler, I may say to those who are not cognisant of the subject, is a boiler where the water is in the tubes and the fire is outside of the tubes, while with the cylindrical boiler the fire is in the tubes and the water is around. The water-tube boilers have this advantage, that they require only one-tenth of the water which is employed in the cylindrical boiler, and, if there were no other considerations, there would be a gain in lightness in favour of the water-tube boiler as against the cylindrical boiler, which requires so much more water. I only make that observation by the way. I now return to water-tube boilers generally. The small water-tube boiler was introduced, I think, as long ago as 1885, and it has been applied since to the destroyers and the torpedo boats, and I doubt whether we could have torpedo boat destroyers in the shape in which we have them, with a speed of thirty knots, without the help of water-tube boilers. But the attack is not made upon the small water-tube boilers; I think they are accepted with their merits and demerits, because, of course, as they have merits, so, too, they have demerits. We have now gone through three or four stages with regard to the machinery, and I may point out, as of some historical interest, that precisely the same outcry which is being raised now against water-tube boilers was raised against triple-expansion machinery before 1892. There was a great prejudice against that form of boiler in the Navy, but it was ultimately overcome.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY (Yorkshire, Shipley): But there was no breakdown at sea.

MR. GOSCHEN: I am coming to the breakdown at sea, if the Committee will have patience. I will try to cover all the ground, but I want the Committee to realise what it means—and perhaps it has some bearing on the breakdown—to have this greater steam pressure. In 1885 in battleships and cruisers the steam pressure of the engines was 95 lb. In 1890 the pressure was 135 lb., and now in battleships we have gone up to 300 lb. in the boilers and 250 lb. at the engines. That is to say that since 1885 we have risen from 90 lb. to 250 lb. as regards the

engines. The Committee will see, even those who understand nothing about steam, that if you have this enormous increase in steam pressure the machinery and all that is constructed to stand that pressure have to undergo a much fiercer test, if I may use the word, than they had to undergo in the old times.

MR. ALLAN (Gateshead): May I remind the right hon. Gentleman that they have that pressure in the mercantile marine?

MR. GOSCHEN: I will come to the mercantile marine; I will endeavour to cover the hon. Gentleman's argument, as well as those of my hon. friend; but the subject is very technical, and I hope hon. Members will permit me to proceed without interruption. The mercantile marine has to do totally different work. The ships of the mercantile marine have a different programme to carry out. They have to do work which the men-of-war have not to do, and the men-of-war have to do work which the mercantile marine have not to do. The mercantile marine can build their engines without regard to a protected deck, below which the engines must be kept and above which it would be dangerous to keep them. Men-of-war must compress their machinery into such space and weight as will enable them to carry armour and guns, and they must reduce all this not only with reference to the construction of boilers, but also with reference to machinery which has to stand the great pressure of 250 lb. at the engines and 300 lb. in the boilers. If the genius of our engineers and the ability of our manufacturers by degrees, working by experience, sometimes by rather painful experience, show that they are able to create machinery and to create all the auxiliary appurtenances to the machinery to stand this test, and also to give lighter machinery—because that is the point—they will have made you more efficient men-of-war, and will have enabled you to compete better with the ships of foreign nations. That is the preliminary answer which I give to my hon. friend opposite. In torpedo boats in 1885 the pressure was 130 lb. to 150 lb. In destroyers in 1895 it was 225 lb. The Committee will see, therefore, that the pressure applied has risen, and it will be seen by a careful study of the subject that the main difficulties are not in the boilers. The main difficulties have been in the engines and in the auxiliary appliances of the ship, and the steam pipes especially, with their present enormous length. The difficulties have been to get a perfect system which will endure this high pressure. Then as regards revolutions. In 1885 the revolutions were seventy-five to eighty-five. Now, in 1900, they are 110. The greatest differences, of course, are in the smaller ships. The smaller cruisers had 110 revolutions, and they have now gone up to 185, the third-class cruisers to 250; in torpedo gunboats they have gone up to 370, and in torpedo boat destroyers to 380 and 400 revolutions. I ask the Committee to consider for a moment these figures, and to see what it means to have these 400 revolutions in a minute, as is done in the torpedo boat destroyers. There are defects continually, and no doubt sometimes those defects are made to reflect on the Belleville boilers. Now I must pass rapidly over the torpedo boat destroyers. The pace is so tremendous, the revolutions are so many, and the pressure is so high, that certain defects are expected. We take that into account in the number of destroyers that we order, and that we arrange for employment in time of war. We say, "We have 100 destroyers; and there will be a certain proportion of them in need of repair." But a torpedo-boat destroyer is always employed near a base; and we are now arranging to have repairing ships for all the groups of destroyers, able to carry out the repairs in case of small accidents to the machinery without having recourse to the dockyards themselves. The small water-tube boilers are always put into the destroyers and into some of the third-class cruisers. In France they have put the small water-tube boilers into some of their very large cruisers; but it is strongly held at the Admiralty—though experience may show this to be wrong—that the small tube boilers have a shorter life than the large tube boilers; and, therefore, where you can use the latter, it is wiser. Mr. Yarrow is hard at work on the whole subject, and it may ultimately be proved that these boilers have a longer life than we can at present assign to them; but, of course, the life of a boiler must be taken into consideration. As to the Belleville boilers, they were first introduced into the British Navy in the "Sharpshooter." They were tried there, and having been

successful, the Admiralty of the day applied them to the "Powerful" and the "Terrible." The "Sharpshooter" is a vessel of about 730 tons, and the "Powerful" and "Terrible" are vessels of 14,000 tons. I well remember the argument used at that time, and it is a very interesting point in connection with water-tube boilers. The water-tube boilers are much smaller than the cylindrical boilers in this respect: that where, in a battleship, you have eight cylindrical boilers you have twenty water-tube boilers. The result is that, if anything goes wrong with one boiler, in the case of water-tube boilers only one-twentieth of the boiler-power is out of action; while in the case of the cylindrical boilers one-eighth is out of action. In the water tube type you distribute the risks over a much wider area, and the accident is smaller in extent. There is this further advantage—that you can repair the water-tube much more easily than the cylindrical boiler. When you have a protected deck it is a very different thing repairing a water-tube boiler from lifting up your deck to get at a cylindrical boiler which represents one-eighth of the whole boiler power. It may fairly be admitted, even by the opponents of the water-tube boilers, that that is one of their advantages. They are easier of access and easier of repair, and the risks are distributed over a larger area. The defects of the water-tube boilers are alleged by their opponents to be that they are less reliable and more exposed to develop defects. The question is, Are these defects inherent or are they remediable? It must be acknowledged that there are defects, though they have been exaggerated. If they are irremediable, then we must abandon the water-tube boilers. But if they are remediable, and if experience shows month by month that you can deal with them; and if other experience shows that frequently these defects have been overcome; then it would be folly to sacrifice the clear advantages of the water-tube boilers because you have given up too soon the task of remedying temporary and not inherent defects, due to inexperience. That is a fair statement of the issue between the two sides. Our position is that the defects are remediable; that they have been in part remedied, and are being further remedied, and we must attempt to secure the advantages of water-tube boilers by endeavouring to meet the defects as they arise. I go back for one moment to the question of the "Sharpshooter" and the "Powerful." The "Powerful" had forty-eight boilers, and the "Sharpshooter" had eight. I will not say that the boilers of the "Powerful" were absolutely a repetition of those in the "Sharpshooter"; but they were only one-third larger; and, therefore, if you had seen the working of the boilers in the "Sharpshooter" you could form a very good opinion of the working of the "Powerful's" forty-eight boilers. There was one element at the time, perhaps, which was not sufficiently considered in the very great stride that had been made; and that is an element which is facing us continually in all this difficult question—namely, the human element. The supervision of forty-eight boilers is a much greater task than the supervision of eight boilers, even after you have multiplied the number of engineers in proportion. The advance was very rapid; and I think it will be found that the defects are not inherent in the "Powerful" and subsequent ships. But there has been difficulty in the insufficient early training of the engineers, stokers, and engine-room artificers in their new and more complicated occupations. Perhaps the advance we made was too rapid; but we had to choose between that and the sacrifice of the additional speed and additional gun-power which the water-tube boiler gives; while it was pretty certain that with the genius of English engineers and the resource of English stokers the initial difficulties of training would be overcome, as we believe that it is being, and as we know that it has been to a large extent elsewhere. The "Powerful" and the "Terrible" were completed, and the "Powerful" was put into commission. Some hon. Members and a portion of the press are accustomed to speak of the "Powerful" as "the lame duck." I am afraid that it is the same with a ship as with a woman—once damage her reputation and she will never recover it. The "Powerful's" reputation has been damaged not by any accident to her boilers, not by anything remotely connected with her water-tube boilers, but by a breakdown at Mauritius and Colombo, due to the heating of her main engines and to some defects in her auxiliary machinery. When she reached Colombo her officers declared that their

only regret was that "some inconsequent man in the House of Commons" had declared the accident to be due to the water-tube boilers. When the "Powerful" arrived at Hong Kong there were lamentable descriptions of her sent home. But she had been the finest ship and the fastest ship, and she had done the fastest trips on the China Station of any vessel in the service. The "Powerful" on the China Station did extremely well. One of the great drawbacks which has to be dealt with is the high coal consumption. She had no economisers. But apart from that she did admirably. From Hong Kong to Manila she steamed for four hours at 20·3 knots, and for twenty-three hours at nearly 20 knots; and no cylindrical boiler ship has ever done such a run on commission. From Hong Kong to Yokohama she steamed for four hours at more than 20 knots; and in the Channel and the Atlantic, for sixty hours, at three-fifths of her power, 15,000-horse power, she steamed at 19·6 knots. A ship that can do 19·6 knots with three-fifths of her power, is a very good ship, and need not be called a "lame duck." The defects stated at the time of these trials were small defects. It is unfair to expect water-tube boilers to perform feats which they were never asked to perform. I do not know whether I ought to speak at such length, but I have felt the importance of this question as being one of the greatest responsibility to the First Lord. These are some of the advantages claimed for the water-tube boiler—greater speed, greater power of getting up speed quickly, lighter weight, and smaller space. This last point is disputed, but there is claimed for them generally greater speed on smaller dimensions, which allows of more guns or heavier guns. These advantages are scarcely denied to the water-tube boilers except by extreme opponents, but it is argued that these boilers are exposed to defects to which the others are not exposed. That is the general charge that is brought against them. If anyone has studied the Paper circulated or the accidents which have taken place they will have seen the many directions in which these defects have occurred, and that in comparative proportion those which have occurred in the boilers as compared with those in the engines and in the steam pipes connected with the engines are very few. I call attention to the last table in the Memorandum circulated, where it is shown that only thirty-eight tubes out of the thousands enumerated there have burst since the accident in the "Terrible." Side by side with this increased pressure to which I have referred, side by side with this more complicated arrangement, there has been an enormous, in some respects a regrettable but unavoidable, increase in all the auxiliary machinery of ships. There are auxiliary engines for the working of the capstan, motors, electric light, and refrigerators. All these engines are put in different parts of the ship connected with steam pipes all along, and with this enormous length of steam piping you have a high pressure operating on the joints of those pipes; and the difficulty arises as much from the multiplication of the machinery as from any principle affecting the boiler, and it is in that direction you must endeavour to find some solution. But the defects are not, as we believe, important defects. There has been one important breakdown enumerated in the Memorandum, the "Hermes." Apart from that, the class of breakdowns generally are with reference to some of the minor arrangements of the ship. All these are brought forward, but what is not brought forward are the successful runs of the ship. We have got a certain number of ships in commission, among them the "Andromeda," the "Niobe," and the "Diadem." All these ships are doing most excellent work. Then you have the "Arrogant" and the "Furious"; they have made excellent runs. There is one ship which has been a disappointment, the "Europa." A curious thing is this, that the "Europa" is a sister ship to the "Andromeda," the "Niobe," and the "Diadem." That the "Europa" is not doing well proves that there must be something in her arrangements not yet discovered, but it is not in the system of boilers, if it were you would find the same defects in the other ships; it is in the management of leaks in unsuspected places or defects of that kind where the disappointment must have taken place. It is very much the same with the "Hermes" and the "Highflyer." All these things require most careful examination, and that examination is continually going on. I claim that we have never tried to hide our difficulties in the least. We have never curtailed the experiments we have made. We have

increased the trials of our ships in every way, and we have made special trials. We are not thinking of damaging our case; we are seeking to get to the bottom of the question of water-tube boilers and testing them in every possible way. The *personnel* of the Fleet has increased at so large a rate that it has been impossible to give that full training to the younger men we should like. There are a number of engineers and stokers who have not had experience on water-tube boiler ships, but we are not going to shrink from putting water-tube boilers into commission, not only with the object of seeing whether they have those defects, but also in order to accustom as many engineers and stokers as possible to the use of those boilers, of which we have so many in the Navy. I have quoted the case of the "Powerful." Here are some special trials of the Belleville boilers. The "Diadem," from Gibraltar to the Nore in 1898, ran 1,330 miles at a speed of 19·27 knots. That is an extremely good run. The "Andromeda," from Gibraltar to Malta, 891 miles, attained a speed of 19·1 knots, using four-fifths of her power only. On a recent occasion the Mediterranean Squadron steamed a distance of 800 miles, from Gibraltar to Aranci Bay. The "Ocean," with the water-tube boilers, steamed 790 miles at four-fifths n.d power, at 16·9 knots, and beat the "Renown," the next fastest of the ships in the Mediterranean Squadron, by one knot, and other battleships by from 1·9 to 2·79 knots. The "Ocean," with the water-tube boilers, is the fastest ship on the Mediterranean station. I should like to clear up one point which is continually raised by hon. Members. I revert again to the question of defects. Are they remediable or irremediable? What is the experience of other countries? I am told that there are hon. Members who have given an indirect warning by conveying that if there is one argument to which they would not listen with patience it would be that the British Navy could learn anything from foreign navies, or that their experience would be in any way a guide to the experience of this country. There are other hon. Members who think, and I have seen it stated in the press within the last few days, that we were going to introduce a fad of the French Navy. I remind those who are so chary of allowing us to look into the doings of other countries, some of which, like the French and the United States, have a very great reputation for engineering, that in the case of the breechloader and the muzzleloader the same kind of language was used with regard to the introduction of French fashions. I remember the struggle there was in order to introduce the breechloader into the Navy. What is the result? The French got the start of us and they have kept it. Again, as to ironclads, the French were the first to use armour. Thus I sweep away the idea that we can learn nothing from other countries. It is a dangerous theory, and it betrays a wrong insular pride and an insular danger. How do we stand as to France? They introduced some time ago, and while we were experimenting carefully, the water-tube boilers into all their battleships. In the whole of their fine Mediterranean squadron, their northern squadron, their combined squadron, I do not think there is a single ship in that fleet which has cylindrical boilers. How do we know that they answer? They have been seen. Some of these ships have been seen for six years. It is our business at the Admiralty to know what the French ships are doing, as it is the business of the French Admiralty to know what we are doing. We know the degree with which they are satisfied with their boilers, and here is a test: they are re-boilering all their old ships that had cylindrical boilers; as fast as they can prepare them, they are putting in water-tube boilers. Why? Because they find the water-tube boiler has been a success and answers the purpose for which they designed it; because they think they have overcome many defects which are due to the training not being sufficient, and because also they think the advantages to be gained are so great that they are bound to proceed. So much for the promise. I feel sure that the House will see that we should be wrong if we brushed away the whole facts. The French First Lord of the Admiralty claims that their Mediterranean fleet is a knot faster than ours; and we cannot deny that the French ships are somewhat faster than ours; but I hope that with the "Ocean" and her sister ships we shall more than make up this lee-way. I say we are bound to take into consideration the fact that the United States, Russia, Japan, all those nations which are now developing their navies so

earnestly, are without hesitation adopting water-tube boilers. They have not only been our example, but the criticisms directed against the defects and the break-downs of those boilers—they have been all that, yet, nevertheless, they are going forward with water-tube boilers, and now every ship in the United States Navy is having water-tube boilers put into it.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): Belleville boilers?

MR. GOSCHEN: I am arguing the question of water-tube boilers *versus* cylindrical boilers. Before I sit down I shall deal with the question of the Belleville boilers. It is more desirable to have one type of boilers than several. We have, however, experimented with another type of water-tube boiler than the Belleville. The experiment has been successful, and we intend to put one into a large cruiser, and I hope that will be satisfactory. I have more plausible opponents than the hon. Member for King's Lynn who say that the whole system of water-tube boilers is wrong; and it is against them that I have been in (entirely friendly) controversy to-night. Now, this is what the Chief Engineer of the United States says on the subject—

"The fact that the water-tube boilers raise steam quickly is of the greatest advantage. I have stated elsewhere that I consider the battle of Santiago to have developed the necessity of the use of water-tube boilers, whether it taught us anything else or not."

That is pretty strong. What they have seen in actual war has convinced them firmly of the advantages of water-tube boilers. And again—

"It would have been the greatest advantage to have had during the blockade of Santiago boilers capable of raising steam in less than half an hour."

In another passage he says—

"In the meantime, all that I can have to say is that the use of water-tube boilers has been definitely decided for our naval vessels, because water-tube boilers give tactical advantages of great moment, and because with care in the selection, manufacture, and management of water-tube boilers, their disadvantages may be neutralised."

That is precisely the position we take up. I do not disguise the disadvantages, but we believe they can be neutralised, and will gradually be neutralised. I have said something with reference to the mercantile marine. It must be remembered that the mercantile marine steamers have perfectly different functions to perform to those of the Royal Navy. The former go from one port to another continuously steaming the whole time, whether at the maximum or it may be with something in hand, I am not prepared to say; but, at all events, their object is to go as fast as possible from one place to another. Their success depends upon their speed, and the coal consumption and other considerations of that kind are absent from their mind.

MR. ALLAN: No.

MR. GOSCHEN: I am afraid I have not expressed myself accurately; but, at all events, what they have got to arrive at is that they shall have the reputation of being the fastest steamer from port to port. Their length does not much matter; they know exactly the docks to which they go and the docks to which they will go back; and, as a parenthesis, let me say that after every voyage they have their machinery examined and little repairs put to rights before they start on their next voyage. Men-of-war, on the other hand, are away sometimes for a year, and their artificers must do the best they can to make good such defects as occur in all steamships. It seems to be supposed in some quarters that the one thing for a man-of-war is to try and get an extra knot at full speed. Here is a curious fact. It will startle hon. Members to know that the difference in speed of the "Powerful" between 18,000 horse-power and 25,000 horse-power is 1·2 of a knot, or say $1\frac{1}{4}$ knots. To put on extra pressure to the extent of 7,000 horse-power for the sake of one extra knot and a quarter, when you are cruising from one port to another without any particular purpose, would surely not be common sense, and our Admirals do not do it, except, it may be, for purposes of experiment. I will show the conditions under which Her Majesty's Navy generally cruise. According to the Queen's Regulations the following is the classification of the speeds to be used on different occasions with natural draught—

"With all despatch, four-fifths power; with despatch, three-fifths power; with ordinary despatch, two-fifths power; and for ordinary steaming, one-fifth power. Air pressure and four-fifths power are only to be used in cases of great urgency."

When hon. Members talk of the "Powerful" "crawling home," her commander is, in fact, simply obeying the Queen's Regulations. I might dilate on the subject of the mercantile marine not adopting water-tube boilers; but I prefer not to do so, for I am afraid I have already almost exhausted the patience of the House—[HON. MEMBERS: No, no.]—I know that whatever I say to-night will not have the effect of allaying the public uneasiness. Partly on account of breaks-down, due to numerous small defects, the smallness of which cannot be appreciated by people generally, but defects which hon. Members by eloquent speeches know how to magnify, a feeling of uneasiness has been created in the public mind. I recognise that the House and the country have with unstinted liberality given the Admiralty all they have asked for in money, and besides that, they have given that which has been valuable to us—namely, their confidence generally. I recognise that with frankness; and seeing that the country has done this, and seeing that from many quarters not hostile to water-tube boilers, but friendly and sympathetic quarters, it has been urged upon me that the country would like to have what they call an impartial verdict on the water-tube boiler, I will consent to an inquiry by a Committee into the subject. I consent to it with some reluctance, and I will tell the Committee why. It disturbs a Department terribly when in the full pressure of their business, with the vast amount of work connected with the Navy to do, with so many ships in commission and under construction, with all the new inventions and appliances, new gun-mountings, new hydraulic arrangements, new electric arrangements, being forced upon them from day to day, which must be examined and which cannot be left entirely to subordinates, but which must pass under the review of those who are responsible to the Board of Admiralty and the country generally—it is, I say, a terrible thing when for a long period they have their time occupied with a Committee sitting at the Admiralty, looking up the whole facts and making good their defence. It would be only human if a great portion of their energy and power were absorbed and hampered by the sitting of such a Committee. I have thought over that and how it could be avoided. I do not know that I can succeed in avoiding it entirely, but what we want is a practical examination of the water-tube boiler in actual operation. I believe, for my own part, the public and this House of Commons will be more satisfied if they had actually seen the water-tube boiler in operation than they would be from the Reports of a Committee, which necessarily in a Committee of this kind must go largely into little details. It is entirely a question of petty details, and I wish to give the Committee every means of satisfying themselves as to the efficiency of the boilers and the class of defects which occur and the means applied to remedy them. What I believe would best meet the case would be a Committee on which practical and sea-going engineers — outside engineers — should be largely represented. It should be part of their functions actually to go to sea in some water-tube boiler ships and examine the question on board ship, both on trial runs and under service conditions. The Committee should also visit some ships in reserve in dockyards, and study the scientific or theoretical as well as the practical side of the question. The "Europa" is one of the ships which I will place at the disposal of the Committee for investigation. She has all these defects, and I should be prepared that they should investigate the whole system of the ship and tell us what is wrong with that ship, as against her sister ship, which has none of these defects. They should also see the "Hyacinth." They can see the "Sharpshooter," with the Belleisle boilers, the "Sheldrake," with the Babcock and Wilcox, and the "Seagull," with the Niclausse boilers—three ships which we propose to use for extra naval purposes and for the training of stokers. They can also see the two ships in commission with the Channel Squadron — the "Diadem" and the "Pelorus." I think it will be recognised that a Committee, all of whose members, of course, would not be prepared to undertake duties of that kind, but a Committee on which men would sit who would have this practical experience, would be a means by which the House and the country might assure themselves either of the efficiency of the boilers or of the remediable or irremediable character of the defects. I hope hon. Members will consent to the appointment of a Committee, which will have the same opportunity as other Committees have of calling witnesses on points which

ay arise in the investigation of the ips. I think I have made a proposal hich will commend itself to those who ish for a practical examination of this mplicated subject.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): I rise at once to xpress what I am sure is the general eling of hon. Members—a feeling of ngratulation towards the right hon. entleman on the decision at which he as arrived. The announcement which e has made, that the Admiralty, while dhering to their opinion on the main uestion, so far as their experience has one, and while maintaining that there as been no rashness or want of adminis-ation, are willing and anxious that the ind of the country should be satisfied on e subject, and that an inquiry of the ind which he has indicated should be ade, will, I think, give great satisfaction n all quarters. The mind of the country as been greatly exercised on the subject. is no reflection whatever on either one de of the House or the other, and for y part I have been anxious for very any years in connection with naval or ilitary matters not to lend myself to nything which would bring either of hose great services into the sphere of olitical and partisan recrimination. I hink I can commend the right hon. entleman the First Lord of the dmiralty for having pursued that policy hilst he has occupied his present position. his has not always been the practice of oards of Admiralty; there has been ather a disposition to make out what reat men we, the existing Board, are, nd what poor creatures those were who ad gone before. I have never seen any race of that spirit in the right hon. entleman. Therefore, it is only carry-ng out the spirit which he has intro-luced into these debates to say that here is nothing in this matter which eads in the direction of party recrimina-ion or feeling. Nor is any censure or riticism involved of the conduct of the Admiralty itself. I trust the right hon. Gentleman and his colleagues at the Admiralty will understand that if I and others get up here and say it is a relief hat there is to be an inquiry, it is not that we have any doubt of the skill and wisdom—so far as mortals an speak with certainty of their wisdom —of the right hon. Gentleman and the Board, but that we feel that it is most desirable that there should not be this uneasy feeling in the country. Sometimes it is almost as harmful that there should be a suspicion of there being something wrong as that there should be something wrong. It is of great importance, when the country is so anxious to support the Department in this great matter of national defence, that the Department should do everything in their power to secure the real confidence of the country. Here is a new departure which is taking place in the propelling machinery of the ships of the Navy. Tremendous experiments are taking place; no doubt some will say it has placed a large portion of our fleet in a very unsatisfactory condition, whilst others would say that if we do not adopt this new system we shall be behind the world in efficiency; but in whichever of these views the truth lies, or whether it lies between them, it is most desirable that we should know from outside, impartial, and expert testimony how the matter stands. I am certain that there will be in the country, as there is within this House to-night, a feeling of intense satisfaction and relief that the right hon. Gentleman, with great public spirit, not minding the appearance of any little triumph for himself, nor caring whether his reputation as a Minister is enhanced or not by the result, is desirous of doing what is right by making inquiry into the matter in this impartial way. By that I believe he will have done much, not only to improve in the end the condition of the Navy, but to improve and strengthen the confidence possessed by the country in the Board of Admiralty and in the Navy itself.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY: The House always welcomes invitations of this kind from the right hon. Gentleman, and it welcomes the candour with which he has dealt with this question of the water-tube boilers. This question of water-tube boilers has been dealt with by successive Admiralty administrations. It first originated in a practical form in the administration of which the right hon. Member for Clitheroe was the Secretary, and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Forest of Dean the Civil Lord, and that being so, I should like to emphasise in the strongest manner the statement thrown out by the right hon. Gentleman opposite, that there is no party feeling in this

matter. We have listened with rapt attention for one hour and a half to a most lucid statement from the First Lord of the Admiralty, but the Committee must have been reminded whilst listening to his speech of two modern phrases—"the old Parliamentary hand," and the Chinese observation, "Saving one's face." From one end to the other of the right hon. Gentleman's speech he attempted, and successfully, to save the face of the Admiralty in regard to much; but there is one part of his speech in which I venture to think he has not made good all that he has claimed for the Admiralty or himself. I refer to the spending of money that has been voted by this House from time to time for ships. The right hon. Gentleman said when introducing the Naval Estimates early in the session that there had been a failure on the part of contractors to earn instalments that would otherwise have been due to them. The right hon. Gentleman said in the early part of the session that the intention was to spend that money still, if contractors were found who were willing to undertake the duty of constructing the vessels; but the armour, hulls, and propelling machinery could not be obtained within reasonable time for delivery from the manufacturers, so that the Administration were restricted in the proposal that they made to the House. Now, what happened after that was that, in consequence of the right hon. Gentleman's statement, certain large firms of the highest possible standing publicly offered to assist in making up the arrears of naval construction. One of these firms was Armstrong, Whitworth, and Co.

MR. GOSCHEN: That firm does not produce its own armour, and can only get it from those firms which are not able to produce sufficient to meet the present requirements of the Admiralty.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY: Can it be said that ships cannot be produced when such a firm as Armstrong, Whitworth, and Company have no Admiralty contract at the present time?

MR. GOSCHEN: Oh, yes; they have.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY: Yes, they have some contracts, but they have no contracts for ships.

MR. GOSCHEN: I wish they had.

MR. FORTESCUE FLANNERY: I wish they had too. If the firm of Armstrong, Whitworth, and Company have no contracts from the Admiralty for ships the Government ought not to be behind hand in getting delivery of ships.

MR. GOSCHEN: I beg my hon. friend's pardon. How can they get materials for the construction of ships unless they get them from the firms who are under contract to us? I am very anxious that this should be made clear, because so much has been said on the subject. They do not make their own materials, but if they were to undertake to build ships, being a strong and wealthy firm, they might offer to manufacturers higher prices than are paid by other shipbuilders. If they got the materials of other people it would be at the risk of delaying the delivery of ships built by other contractors.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY: Surely my right friend is drawing unduly on the credulity of the House when he asks the House to believe that Armstrong, Whitworth and Company would publicly undertake to give delivery of ships within a certain time without inquiring and knowing beforehand whence they would get the materials to build those ships.

MR. GOSCHEN: How would they carry it out? They could only carry it out by paying such handsome prices as would prevent sub-contractors from fulfilling their contracts to all other firms. There are only limited sources of material.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY: I say that it is incredible that a firm of such standing as Armstrong, Whitworth, and Company have attained would take up the position either that they did not know where to get materials or that they intended to outbid the contractors to the Admiralty for the materials obtainable in the market. May I remind the right hon. Gentleman that there are such persons as Admiralty overseers—men who are sent to attend every day in the works where work is going on, and who might be relied upon to absolutely prevent details such as Armstrong, Whitworth, and Company would purchase from having precedence over details already ordered by the Admiralty. I do not think, with every respect to the right hon. Gentleman, that his position is tenable. The illustration

of the picture which my right hon. friend gave is one that fails at its very inception. The illustration fails in this, that it is not one picture, but a picture this year and next year and the year afterwards that would be required. It is a series of ships that are required, and not one ship. The facts are—and it is impossible to get away from them—that this House has voted money for the purpose of new construction of ships, and that, by the admission of my right hon. friend, that money has not been spent. Now, when a Supplementary Estimate is being introduced to the House, there is no suggestion of new ships as distinguished from small craft, and no attempt made to take advantage of the public offer of firms of importance to enter into contracts for vessels to make up the deficiency of the past year.

MR. GOSCHEN: These firms will have an opportunity of tendering for the six armoured cruisers that are to be put out to contract.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY: Do I understand my right hon. friend to say that if vacancies still remain in the private yards, after these contracts have been taken up, the Admiralty will avail themselves of the opportunity to make up some of the arrears of naval construction?

MR. GOSCHEN: Yes, if I could be convinced that in regard to the armour it would not interfere with the fulfilment of present contracts.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY: I believe that Members of the House generally are of opinion that these arrears of naval construction ought to be made up without any hesitation whatever. The necessity for naval construction has recently become more accentuated than ever. The German Parliament has passed a Bill for the increase of the Navy by a majority of two to one. Affairs in the far East are so far developing that one cannot tell what may be the ultimate necessity for naval preparations for this country. So long as the Admiralty give the assurance that the arrears and defects in connection with our administration in preparation for the Navy are not in any degree likely to be repeated, then I feel certain that the House will be satisfied. There is some encouragement in the fact that the Admiralty have purchased six new torpedo boat destroyers. I believe the Admiralty have done most wisely in purchasing a vessel which has the enormously high speed of 36 knots—a vessel with an entirely new kind of machinery which engineers believe will develop into a great and enormous improvement on anything that has gone before it. I come now to the question on which my right hon. friend laid the greatest stress in the course of his speech—the question of the boilers in Her Majesty's fleet. If the Committee will bear with me I will very briefly remind them of the history of this question, and of the reason why boilers of the new type have been eagerly seized upon by the Admiralty. It is an axiom which any one can understand in the designing of a ship, that any saving of weight in the propelling machinery will have the effect of enabling either more coal to be carried for the purpose of propulsion, or the taking on board of heavier guns and a larger quantity of ammunition. On the other hand, if there is a saving of weight in the boilers, then machinery of larger power giving greater speed may be put into the vessel, and thicker armour may be employed. There had been, as the right hon. Gentleman stated, attempts made as early as 1885 to lighten the boilers, and thereby to improve the performances of war ships. First of all an attempt was made to use the locomotive boiler. That was an abject failure. The failure was recognised quickly, and that type of boiler as applied to naval purposes was quickly withdrawn. Then came the era of the water-tube boiler, and the course adopted by the Admiralty was one with which no one could find fault. It would be interesting to recall the composition of the Committee who some years ago recommended the adoption of the water-tube boiler in the first instance. There were the chief engineers of Lloyds, the Board of Trade, and the P. and O. Company—all of them men of scientific attainment and capable of dealing with this question in a practical as well as a scientific way. The Committee took evidence, and the members went to see what the new boiler might do. They reported in favour of a limited test of water-tube boilers in one vessel of small size, and the complaint that has been made in this House every year, when the Estimates have been discussed, is that

there has been no proper test of the endurance of this new type of boiler, although ship after ship, time after time, has been fitted with these boilers. It is also complained that this change has been entirely carried out without any real attempt to test the endurance at a high speed for a long period. Considerable allusion has been made to the "Powerful." I ventured to ask the right hon. Gentleman a question recently as to the performances of the sister ship "Terrible" in carrying troops. There was some difference between my right hon. friend and myself upon the question of the length of the passage. I made it out from the newspaper reports to be five and a half or six days, but my right hon. friend made it five days. Assuming it to be five days for 1,800 miles, that vessel, carrying troops, in circumstances of the greatest national emergency, made a speed of fifteen miles an hour from Hong-Kong to Ta-ku. Can it be said that a vessel that appears in the Navy List as a twenty-two knot vessel was thus doing a performance which was satisfactory to the Admiralty, or which ought to be satisfactory to the country? Whilst our countrymen were immured in Peking to the imminent danger of their lives, the vessel carrying troops for their succour was not capable of going, or, at all events, did not go, at the highest speed which is claimed for her by the Admiralty. I do not know why we have not had some explanation of the passage—some accurate statement of the figures. If my figures are wrong, what are the correct figures? No doubt that is a matter that the new Committee will be able to deal with, but at present we are as much in the dark about it as when the question was first brought before the attention of the House. My right hon. friend has drawn a parallel between the Royal Navy and the mercantile marine. He has suggested that the difference between the boilers in Her Majesty's ships and the boilers of the mercantile marine is so complete that no fair comparison can be drawn. A fair comparison is this—that never, in all the trials which are set forth in the Memorandum issued to the House three days ago, was there a trial of endurance as regards length of passage with boilers of this type equal to what is ordinarily performed by vessels in the mercantile marine. We have in crossing the Atlantic every day one vessel or another at her highest speed of 20 knots, and that without any idea that the test of endurance is too prolonged. I challenge my right hon. friend to indicate in this Memorandum a single instance of a test of endurance as long as in the case of those merchant steamers crossing the Atlantic in the ordinary course of their duty. If such a test had been made, and the results had proved that vessels with boilers of this type were capable of prolonged service at sea without breaking down, there would have been no necessity for this discussion, no necessity for the Memorandum which has been issued, and no necessity for the Committee which has at last been granted to investigate this question. I feel that acknowledgment should be made by the House to the right hon. Gentleman for this concession, which, as the Leader of the Opposition has said, is required to calm the uneasy feeling that undoubtedly exists throughout the country. But there is a claim in the Memorandum issued to the House which I feel certainly may be premature. The Admiralty has had the effrontery to state that a total of sixty-one ships—first, second, and third class cruisers—would, if fitted with cylindrical boilers, have had at least a knot less speed than they now will have on account of the water-tube boilers. May I refer to the question of the weight of boilers of this character? What is the advantage of saving weight if the consumption of coal is greater, and if the weight of the water and coal combined is greater in the new type than in the old? Some of the figures that are stated in the Memorandum are extremely interesting. A trial was made between the "Minerva" and the "Highflyer"—the "Highflyer" having water-tube boilers and the "Minerva" cylindrical boilers. The figures are not fully stated in the Memorandum, and if I have made any mistakes perhaps I may be corrected. In the first trial——

MR. GOSCHEN: Do you challenge the accuracy of the figures?

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY: What I say is that the figures are not given fully. I am going to state the detailed figures of each particular run, and if the details I am giving are not accurate I hope the right hon. Gentleman will give

the correct figures. They are taken from an engineering newspaper, and are, I believe, correct. During the first run of sixty hours at ten knots the "Minerva" consumed 27 per cent. less fuel than the "Highflyer," and at the end of the trial could have started for a voyage anywhere—to Australia or across the Atlantic. Immediately after the trial was concluded the "Highflyer," with water-tube boilers, was five days under repair. All the artificers from the other ships of the fleet were reported to have been on board. There were two runs of sixty hours each at fourteen knots. The "Minerva" had 380 tons and the "Highflyer" 463 tons. Again, after these two trials, the "Highflyer" was under repair for six days, while the "Minerva," after this test of endurance, was capable of proceeding to sea anywhere she might be sent. There were two other runs of thirty hours, each ship at full power, and again the "Minerva" consumed much less coal than the "Highflyer." On these runs the "Highflyer" consumed 18 per cent. more than the other vessel. Again, the "Highflyer" received heavy repairs, while the "Minerva" was ready for sea immediately after the trials were finished. If we find that on a run of sixty hours between these two sister ships the water-tube boilers consumed 100 tons more coal than the cylindrical boilers, the amount of weight claimed in the Memorandum as being saved by the adoption of water-tube boilers is really not saved, and with such an enormous consumption of coal you reduce the fighting power of the ship. I venture to say that such vessels as the "Hermes" are a danger and a trap to the engineers who man them. If I may be excused for saying so, I regret very much to notice that in a recent answer to a question the suggestion was made that the court-martial on the "Hermes" had found that it was on account of the fault of the engineers that such a misfortune should happen in a ship as that which took place. The Admiralty say that the ship was helpless at mid-ocean, and had to be towed a long distance—1,600 or 1,800 miles—to a port of refuge. From the inquiry it was found that the boilers were completely helpless. The suggestion was that the engineers had neglected to do their duty in the way of supplying these boilers with proper care and attention. I believe it would be found that the facts are rather the reverse, and that the anxiety, overwork, and over-pressure arising from the necessary close attention to the delicate operations of these boilers actually drove the engineer into sickness and led to a mutiny amongst the stokers down below. British stokers will never hesitate to go into danger when it is necessary in the service of the country; but when a danger is gratuitously put upon them by having to attend boilers which are continually giving out and causing explosions at the most unexpected times, the result will be, as in the case of the "Hermes," that insubordination will arise, necessitating a lieutenant to go down into the stokehole to maintain that discipline which the engineers have no power to keep because they are not executive officers. These are some of the facts which have aroused uneasiness in the country. I do not propose to enlarge upon these matters, because the whole object of the motion for the reduction of this Vote which I had the honour to place on the Paper some time ago has now been attained. I do not believe that any of the hon. Gentlemen in this House who have been raising difficulties and doubts about these boilers desire anything more than an impartial inquiry and proper tests of their endurance. The criticism of hon. Members on both sides of the House has not been directed against any person at the Admiralty. They have been criticisms of a system. The right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Admiralty, in his remarkable speech this afternoon, has entered into all the details with great accuracy and in the most painstaking manner. This has occurred not on account of the want of engineering skill, but because of the system, and because of the inadequate staff which exists at the Admiralty to support Sir William White and Sir John Thurston. But when the Committee is appointed, let it not be in any degree a substitute for the necessary increase in the staff at the Admiralty. The Navy has been extended enormously in recent years, and the work that has been put upon the members of the scientific branch of the Admiralty has been out of proportion altogether to human endurance, or to what the Government has a right to expect from the men in that Department. I do not see that there is in this Supplementary Vote any suggestion of any increase in the Admiralty staff. That increase must come, whether in this

or succeeding years, and we must have not merely an increase in the *personnel* of the scientific branch, but we must have an increase in the number of engineers afloat. When that increase is made and when the *personnel* of the Fleet is improved by an addition of a number of the best engineers, my right hon. friend will find that his difficulty about water-tube boilers will rapidly disappear. Before I sit down I would like to refer in a sentence to the argument based on the adoption of water-tube boilers by foreign navies. I do not think my right hon. friend has been fairly accused this afternoon of not being willing to profit by the example of foreign fleets. By all means let us obtain the information from wherever it is possible to obtain it. When it is suggested that any portion of our Fleet is in a parlous state it should be remembered that it is no answer to say that foreign navies with whom we have to fight are in an equally parlous state. That is no argument at all. We must have the very best that can be obtained, both in men and material. I believe the course which the right hon. Gentleman has taken will give general satisfaction, and will increase largely the confidence of the country in the administration which he guides so patiently and so successfully.

*Sir CHARLES DILKE: The hon. Member who has just sat down was allowed by you, Mr. Lowther, to touch very briefly a point which was touched upon by the First Lord of the Admiralty, and which appears to me to have a most essential bearing upon the question of water-tube boilers, which has been submitted to the House. Upon that question I do not feel myself competent to offer an opinion, for it is a highly technical subject, but having read nearly everything which is sufficiently non-technical which has been written upon this subject, I am convinced that what the First Lord of the Admiralty called the human element plays a very large part indeed in connection with it. While hitherto I have hesitated to accept the view upon this question of the hon. Member for Gateshead, I am convinced that he has proved the other side of the case, which we are not in order in discussing now, namely, that the human element plays an enormous part in the matter, and that you are not dealing out fair treatment to any of your boilers unless you increase the number and efficiency of the men in your engine-room and strengthen your engineering department. There was one observation in the First Lord's speech as to which I should like to say a word. The right hon. Gentleman dealt with the experiments which had been made with non-combustible wood. He stated that we had no evidence that during the destruction by fire of the Spanish and Chinese ships the decks had been left flooded with water. That was contrary to the official information which had been given in the United States. The American reports which I have seen upon this subject do state that a fire occurred both in the Chinese and their own war in cases in which the decks were flooded, and I think it is necessary to diminish the amount of wood to an extent to which we have not yet aimed. That is all I wish to say upon this subject. I now turn for a few minutes to what I confess seems to me to be the most important portion of the speech to which the House has listened with so much interest, and that is what the right hon. Gentleman has told us about his programme, which really constitutes his revised programme, for the present year. The state of things which was alluded to just now by the hon. Member for the Shipley Division is one in which I associate myself with the general views expressed by my hon. friend without adopting his particular arithmetic. The importance of the subject is as great as any question that can possibly be brought before this Committee or before this House. The Prime Minister has made a statement as to the position of the country, and he has recommended the country to adopt a new and extraordinary means of defence by establishing rifle clubs. I think this danger is entirely covered by a proper programme in regard to the British Fleet. The vast majority of the people of this country deny the possibility of dealing with the dangers which the Prime Minister has pointed out as the natural fate of a maritime power—and which he described as "a blow directed against the heart"—by means of rifle clubs. We believe in naval means of meeting the dangers; and the programme of the First Lord of the Admiralty has been criticised as being an insufficient naval programme in face of the dangers. The Prime Minister says what all of us feel, that at some period a coalition of

Powers may be formed against us. He may have exaggerated the danger, but I wish to point out that at the beginning of this session the First Lord of the Admiralty was criticised for the manner in which he has allowed his performances year by year to fall below his programme. The reasons given in February last by the right hon. Gentleman for the performance falling short of his programme were deficiencies in propelling machinery and in armour. I think we ought to keep before our eyes the reason which is given to this House for falling short in the programme which was considered absolutely necessary for the safety of the country. Earlier in the session the First Lord of the Admiralty replied to the hon. Member for Chester; dealing with those questions to-night, he spoke of them as an absurd charge against the Admiralty that their arrears from year to year should be added together. We know what the point is. Year by year we have been told that the sum of money asked for is the least that the Admiralty can safely do with, and yet we have always fallen short in that expenditure, and we have continued to fall short year by year. In the year 1898 there was a very great arrear, and in March, 1899, alluding to that arrear, the First Lord of the Admiralty said that—

> "The programme is the lowest which can be justified by the existing expenditure on shipbuilding of other Powers."

It is a serious thing, however you put it, arithmetic or no arithmetic, when admittedly we cannot complete a programme which is described in language of that kind. That is an admitted and acknowledged fact, and the reasons given for this falling short are difficulties with regard to the contractors. The right hon. Gentleman gave the same reason in February last, and he used the same phrase as last year. This year we have got into arrear again, and the reason given is that there have been deficiencies in the supply of armour and propelling machinery. To-night the First Lord of the Admiralty has said that we cannot spend the money if the contractors do not earn it, and the "contractors cannot do more." That is practically a statement to this Committee to the effect that the resources of this country are insufficient to supply the armour and the propelling machinery which are considered to be necessary by the Admiralty for the safety of the country, and that is an admission which, as a supporter of the general policy of the right hon. Gentleman, I confess I am not able to accept. The First Lord of the Admiralty has stated that all this expenditure is necessary for the safety of the country, and the Prime Minister has put the danger to the country even higher than it has ever been put by an Opposition speaker, and yet in that year we fall short in our expenditure upon the Navy. We have been told that for the first time we are likely to come up to our promises this year in regard to our performances. In the meantime there has been a controversy between the hon. Member for Shipley and the First Lord of the Admiralty as to the possibility of adding to our contractors a particular firm, but the First Lord of the Admiralty questions whether the firm alluded to—Armstrong's—ought to be added to the list in view of the work they are already doing for the Admiralty. It must be remembered that all this time firms who do not contract with the Admiralty and some firms who do have been completing a considerable number of first-class armoured ships for foreign Powers, and I cannot help thinking that if the arrangement of prices is properly managed it would not be impossible for us to draw upon these firms ourselves which are completing ships for foreign Powers. Some of our own firms who have contracts with us have large contracts with foreign Powers. Armstrong's have contracts to complete ships for foreign Powers, and they have no ship contracts with us. In face of the fact that some eight or nine great firms are making propelling machinery of the first class and of the largest kind in this country for other Powers, and that several firms are building ships for other countries, I cannot believe that the productive power of this country is as short as it is supposed to be, and if the national emergency is as great as described by the First Lord himself and by the Prime Minister, our performance ought to be larger than it is, and when a programme has been agreed to by this House we ought not to fall short of that programme. The First Lord of the Admiralty has admitted—indeed, it is part of his case—that there has been a great slowness in carrying out his programme even such as it is. He has pointed out how slow we have been both in contract ships and in dockyard ships in regard to propelling

machinery and armour plate. The House is often reassured by the more optimistic class of speakers that we have such extraordinary powers of building ships fast in this country that we can afford to be behind other Powers. That is not the view of the First Lord now, and he has not recently made use of that argument. Nevertheless, it is very often used in the country, and we very often read it in the speeches of hon. Gentlemen opposite. We have got ourselves into the habit of falling behind with our ships. The engineering strike has been given as the alleged reason for all our difficulties, and no doubt that strike had a continuing effect beyond the actual moment of the lock-out, and its effects were felt in subsequent years. But the delay in the ships is continuing to be very great indeed, and I would like to give the House two or three examples. In the March, 1896 programme the "Albion" was to have been completed in August, 1899, but that ship is not now expected to be completed until September, 1901. The "Glory" in the same programme, although not so much behind, is also very late, but the excuse in this case is the financial difficulty of the contractor for engines. There was a Japanese ship of the same character which was begun at the same time by the same contractor, and which was delivered more rapidly and completed. As regards the March, 1897, programme the same thing occurred again. The "Formidable," the "Irresistible," and the "Implacable" were to have been completed in March, 1900, but they are not yet complete. This is a matter about which the Committee ought to have some information. In the case of these three ships the excuse is that the delay is caused by a difficulty as to parts of the armour. This matter of armour has been brought before this Committee year after year by specialists representing either the trade or the constituencies concerned, and I think it has been gone into no less than eight times within the last four years. I confess that I think this difficulty in regard to armour ought to have been overcome by now. No doubt changes in the plant have been required, but the First Lord of the Admiralty admitted last year that we must get the plant, and that if we could not get it by one plan we must get it by another. Although I should prefer to do this by the ordinary form of contract in the open market, yet we must obtain this armour e ven if we have to go into partnership with manufacturers. Again, the ships of the "Duncan" class—the "Duncan," the "Cornwallis," the "Exmouth," and the "Russell," of the revised programme of 1898—are very backward, and are more backward than the corresponding Russian ships which they were designed to meet. If you take the case as put before us in the very excellent tables published in the last Naval Annual it will be seen that only three battleships have really been completed in the two years immediately preceding the publication of the last Naval Annual. Of the battleships provided by the March, 1896, programme only half—namely, three out of six—have been completed up to the present time. In the most recent debate in the French Chamber on this subject, when they discussed the whole question of the possibility of war between France and this country, it was clear that battleships have again come to the front, and we must be prepared to see a considerable accession to the number of battleships possessed by foreign Powers. I do not suppose that anyone would press the right hon. Gentleman to revise his programme at this moment in regard to the contracts for additional battleships. As regards cruisers it may be taken as admitted that we are short. The reason given for this deficiency and for not laying down more cruisers is the difficulty of obtaining propelling machinery.

MR. GOSCHEN: And armour.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: I was only repeating the reason given in this House as to propelling machinery—one which has been given for a long time. The first class cruisers promised in the March, 1896, programme for completion before March, 1900, are not yet complete, and they will very soon have been five years in hand. The excuse given, as in the case of the battleships "Albion" and "Glory" in the same programme, is the financial difficulties of the contractor for engines. The third class cruisers in the same programme are almost as backward, and the armoured cruisers of the revised programme of 1897, which are ships very urgently needed at the present time, according to the statement of the First Lord, are already a year behind time. As regards

armoured cruisers of the 1898 programme, the twenty-three-knot cruisers, urgently needed, on the average were not laid down until fifteen months after the announcement made in the House, and the armoured cruisers of the revised programme of 1898 not until eighteen months afterwards. In some cases the Admiralty have found it necessary to accelerate the dates of launching, although they do not finish the ships. That is the case not only with contract ships, but also with dockyard ships, like the "Drake" and "Essex," which, I think, are to be hurried forward to no good end, as Pembroke Dock is insufficiently equipped. The admirals of the fighting squadrons are not satisfied with the number of cruisers at their disposition at the present time, and I cannot but think that to commission additional cruisers would be a more reasonable precaution than to adopt rifle clubs. The First Lord has announced the purchase of five destroyers, and he has stated that that is a considerable addition to the strength of this country. We reproached him in February last with not having provided more destroyers, and he now tells us that he was thinking of purchasing these destroyers at the time, but he did not announce the fact because it would put up the price against himself. I confess that I think this is a welcome purchase, although I think that an even larger addition to the number of destroyers would have been wise. My main reason for rising and taking part in this debate is my conviction that the resources of the country are sufficient, if properly used, to fill up the programme which the First Lord of the Admiralty himself thinks is necessary, and the difficulty of obtaining armour and propelling machinery, although it may be a convenient argument to use once, when some particular shortness may have occurred, is an unsound argument, and is not a proper excuse when it is alleged to the House year by year. In face of the fact that we are building for foreign countries at a time when there is a national emergency, I think we ought to be able to obtain sufficient propelling machinery and armour.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): Undoubtedly the right hon. Baronet has put his finger on a radical defect in the management of the Admiralty, if not in its intelligence. It is undoubtedly true that this country is capable of building as many battleships and cruisers, and producing as much armour, as is required. I am going to go a little further and suggest that the reason may possibly be that the Admiralty have never yet understood how to deal with contractors, for they beat them down in their prices in an absurd way.

MR. GOSCHEN: Under our present system we do not beat the prices down. We invite tenders, but we do not always accept the lowest.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I really cannot weary the Committee by going into details, although I have them here. The case I had in my mind was one of seven years ago when tenders were invited for torpedo destroyers. Tenders were given by two firms, one of which was Messrs. Yarrow. That tender was not accepted; they would not do it for the money; and they were then offered a little more. It was a case of beating up instead of beating down, but it is the same principle. You must deal with your contractors in a proper and even generous way. If you do not, the result will be that the best contractors will not work for you, but will fill their yards with foreign work when they should be working for us. I have heard that continually alleged, and the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean goes so far as to suggest a reason. I think there may be other reasons. There may be, for instance, a want of proper foresight on the part of the Admiralty, and, consequently, too great a delay in ordering the armour required. I believe that is largely the case. If you want the best work you must go to the best contractors; if you want the best contractors you must treat them fairly, and even handsomely. As to this question of armour, it is absurd to say that this country cannot produce armour sufficient for the needs of the Navy. But let us assume for a moment that the private contractor cannot produce the armour required. Then I say it is possible for the Admiralty—nay, it is the duty of the Admiralty—to do one of two things; either, as the right hon. Baronet has suggested, to go into a *quasi*-partnership with the armour producers, and by promise of orders induce manufacturers to put up machinery to carry

out the work, or to take the bull by the horns and set up rolling machinery in the dockyards. You have had to take a similar course with regard to the building of ships, and if there is no other way, you must do it with regard to the supply of armour. But to come year after year and say that you cannot get this, and you cannot get that, in a manufacturing country of the illimitable capacities of this country, is really to give a reason which cannot be readily accepted by the House of Commons for not carrying out the naval programme which we have been told is the least that is absolutely essential. I come now to the question of boilers, and that seems to me to be even more important. I am afraid I must believe that the boilers we have in the larger number of our most important ships are not satisfactory. If that is so, we may at any moment find this country in a state of most horrible danger. Everybody must feel that great events are impending—great events in the East, great events in Europe—and we never know the day when we may be called upon to put forth what is after all our only power—our sea power. If it be that there are conditions in our ships which are such that those ships cannot be relied upon for service in emergency or generally, if there be some serious fundamental fault in their machinery or boilers, or in both, which render them unreliable—capable of doing great things on one day and breaking down the next, for goodness knows how long—if we are in that position, we are in the most serious position that the country could possibly be in, and one which it behoves Her Majesty's Government to deal with immediately. The right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Admiralty, has indeed given away his case. He admits, or he does not dispute, that, on the whole, the water-tube boiler has been unsatisfactory.

MR. GOSCHEN was understood to dissent.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I will put it in another way. The right hon. Gentleman admits there was great uneasiness about it—so great an uneasiness that even he himself could not remove it. Therefore, I think the case is admittedly, on his own words, a very very serious one.

MR. GOSCHEN was understood to explain that the defects were remediable.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I do not wish to put it in the least higher than the right hon. Gentleman himself put it. He said the defects in his opinion were remediable, but the apprehension was not remediable. I want to make one remark on the right hon. Gentleman's speech, because I do not think he has apprehended the case against the boilers. He spoke all through of the water-tube boilers. My belief is, and I think it is the belief of a great many Members of this House, that the water-tube principle—that is, the principle of putting the water instead of the fire into the tubes—is a good principle. I am not an expert on this question, but I have endeavoured to acquaint myself with the subject, and that is the belief I have come to. The only question is whether the Belleville boiler is good. Here is a Memorandum prepared for this very debate. What do we find there? I do no know whether the right hon. Gentleman wrote it; I imagine not; the English is not good enough. What the writer of this paper says is this—

> "The Admiralty policy has been to consider the Belleville boiler, with which they have had more experience than any other type of water-tube boiler, as the approved type for large ships."

"Water-tube boilers" here, then, does not mean water-tube boilers in general, but the type approved by the Admiralty—the Belleville. The water-tube boiler may be good; it may be the most perfect invention the brain of man has ever put into a steam engine; but if the Belleville be bad it is no answer to us. The writer further says—

> "But in this paper it is only necessary to compare the Belleville boiler with the cylindrical boiler."

That is all that is necessary to do to-night, but that is the very thing the right hon. Gentleman has not done. He has all through compared water-tube boilers generally with cylindrical boilers. I do not care what he proves about water-tube boilers, if it be true, as I am afraid it is true, that our particular form of water-tube boiler—the Belleville—is unsatisfactory and cannot be trusted. The right hon. Gentleman is good enough to say he will not find it difficult to deal with me as an adversary. He will not. I recognise the great power and capacity,

the enormous energy and industry, which the right hon. Gentleman has brought to his work. The Committee must recognise the almost masterly engineering way in which the right hon. Gentleman described the water-tube boiler to-night, stating frankly many of its defects and mentioning still more frankly many of its excellencies, involved a great deal of work not altogether familiar to Members of this House. I will not go into details; I will not even read the facts set forth in the Memorandum showing how in one of the trials on which the Admiralty rely, the ship with the Belleville boiler drank nearly six times as much water as the ship with the cylindrical boiler. That is a very serious matter, because it is not the water only. The extra water means extra coal, and therefore every extra pound of water that the Belleville boiler drinks means more coal in order to distil it. There is one other thing. The right hon. Gentleman drew a large distinction between the two kinds of water-tube boilers. He spoke of the large sort and the small sort—that is, the water-tube boiler with large tubes and the water-tube boiler with small tubes—as though they were two beings of totally different races coming from different countries. But they are the same boiler. The essential principle of the two is the same, and it is possible to make the small tube boiler with larger tubes and fit it into a larger vessel. That is exactly what the French are doing; they are fitting their vessels with water-tube boilers of the torpedo-boat destroyer sort, but made with larger tubes—such as the Normand, the Yarrow, the Thornycroft, and the Guyot. The right hon. Gentleman rather suggested to the Committee—I do not think he meant to do it, but it was the inference suggested to us who do not know much about boilers—that for large ships you must have large tube boilers, and for small ships small tube boilers, and that consequently you must have the Belleville boiler for large ships, although you might have the Thornycroft or the Yarrow for the small.

MR. GOSCHEN explained that he did not intend to convey that impression; he meant that small water-tube boilers were generally provided for the smaller ships.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I quite accept the right hon. Gentleman's statement that he did not intend to convey that idea, but in the unsophisticated frame of mind with which I endeavour to approach all new questions that was the inference suggested to me. The Memorandum states and the right hon. Gentleman says that one of the great advantages of the Belleville boiler is that you get less weight. I think the hon. Gentleman below the gangway rather disposed of that when he showed that although you get less weight in the machinery and in the boilers, you get as much weight in the coal.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY: And more.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Then, says the right hon. Gentleman and also the Memorandum, you get better speed. My hon. friend opposite shakes his head. I am going to assume that do you get better speed. But when do you get it? Perhaps on one day in twenty, when the boiler is going properly, you get your extra knot, but on the next——

MR. GOSCHEN complained that that was a most unjust description; it was just the same as in other ships.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I think not. If hon. Members will refer to this Memorandum they will see that they act unlike other ships. Take the "Highflyer" and the "Minerva." The former was continually breaking down; the latter never. I do not say it always happened, but you cannot rely on it not happening, and reliance is the very essence of the action of the Fleet. The old cylindrical boiler may not have had the advantages—I think it had not—that the water-tube boiler has, but at any rate you could always rely upon it, week in, week out—nay, year in, year out. For year after year the cylindrical boilers have gone on with a little looking into at the end of each voyage, and they have done their work perfectly well. The "Royal Arthur" at the present moment can get as good a speed with her cylindrical boilers as when she was built twenty-five or thirty years ago. As to the foreigner, I quite agree with the right hon. Gentleman, we must sweep away our national prejudice if we can

learn anything by so doing. I am most anxious to learn everything possible from the foreigner. What does the foreigner teach us? Let us see what is found in this Memorandum. I will summarise it in a very short way. All foreign nations, says the Memorandum, have adopted water-tube boilers. Yes; but not the Belleville. The Belleville boiler is the only one with which I am concerned, as sixty-one of our largest ships are fitted with it. We have in the Memorandum an account of what the different nations have done. The really important marine nations are these—and I put them in order of importance: England, France, United States, Holland, and Germany. What have we to learn from the foreigners? Germany uses the Thornycroft, the Schültz, the Niclausse, and the Dürr boilers; but out of the thirty ships named in this Memorandum only two have Belleville boilers. In Holland every boiler—on large ships, too—of 10,000 indicated horse-power is a Yarrow with the larger tubes. There are eight of these ships in the list, and not one of them has a Belleville boiler. In the United States they use the Thornycroft, the Babcock and Wilcox, the Niclausse, and the Mosher; but in all the nineteen ships named there is not a single Belleville boiler. Now I come to France, and this is really the crucial instance. It was in France the Belleville boiler was invented twenty-one years ago by a naval officer of very great scientific attainments and ability. With regard to the Belleville boiler, I have never been shipmates with it, as they say; but I have been alongside of it, and having seen a great deal of it was touched with a profound admiration for it. I remember having my doubts as to the wisdom of the policy adopted by Gentlemen on the other side when they first put this boiler, without any trial, in a big ship like the "Powerfull" or the "Terrible." But in the "Sharpshooter" I conceived a great admiration for it, and I stood up in this House and said it was a very good boiler. That is one reason why I am here to-day—to put on a white sheet. In France, and this is most important, the earlier ships—I am now really confining myself to the list in the Memorandum — were all fitted with Belleville boilers, but if hon. Members will look at the Memorandum they will see what a change has been coming over the mind of France in regard to these boilers. Of the fifteen cruisers of 1899 and 1900 only six have Belleville boilers. That is in France, the original country of the Belleville boilers—France, in which it is almost patriotism to use the Belleville boiler. The right hon. Gentleman will understand that I have no quarrel against the Niclausse, the Yarrow, the Guyot, the Babcock and Wilcox, or any other of the twenty types of boilers; my quarrel, my doubt, my horror, are all reserved for the Belleville alone. Of the fifteen cruisers, armoured and protected, named in this Memorandum, only six have Belleville boilers. All battleships built in 1896 or 1898 have Belleville boilers, but those of 1899 and 1900 have not Belleville but Niclausse boilers. The two latest battleships on which the French mostly rely, and which have excited the horrors and fears of the right hon. Baronet opposite, the "Suffren" and the "Henri IV.," have the Niclausse boilers. First of all, I say that the figures I have shortly put forward with regard to France show that she is recovering from the Belleville craze, which she had in a strong form; she has now forty ships against our sixty-one fitted with the Belleville boiler; but she is recovering from the craze, and—I make this assertion with such responsibility as I have in this Committee—the authorities responsible for French naval construction believe that the Belleville boiler is bad in principle and difficult to work in practice, and they have ceased to believe in it as the boiler of the future. That is my assertion, and I make it on good grounds. My information is recent, and, as the figures show a tendency to avoid the Belleville boiler on the part of the French Government, so I assert the future will show to a certainty that the French Government have absolutely given up the belief in the Belleville boiler for large ships. I have made a bold assertion, but the right hon. Gentleman has a Naval Intelligence Department here and an Ambassador in Paris, and he can ascertain whether I am right or wrong. If he can in any way show that I am wrong in what I have said, I shall be very glad to retract it. I say this further: In the "Jeanne d'Arc" it is a Guyot boiler, I believe. There is really no generic difference between a boiler with small tubes and a boiler with large tubes; I believe they are essentially the same, but when you use them in torpedo boats you make

them with small tubes, and when you use them in a large vessel you make them with large tubes. All the arguments with regard to foreign nations are arguments against the Belleville boilers, not against water-tube boilers. The experience of the Admiralty action of Germany, Holland, the United States, nay, of France herself, is an experience which should induce us to give up these Belleville boilers. But we have got them in sixty-one of our ships, and we have got to live with them. Here I am in entire agreement with the hon. Gentleman near me. The human element does come in, and I am afraid that the Admiralty have not always taken sufficient account of that human element. The Belleville boiler is such a box of tricks as never before was put into a ship. It is like a lady's watch, always getting out of order and requiring most delicate handling. It requires to be stoked to a nicety, and when defects occur they require to be repaired to a nicety. If you are to live with the Belleville boiler you must treat stoking no longer as unskilled or *quasi*-unskilled labour; it is a fine art, and you require artists to do it. How are you to get them? Other nations have been in the same difficulty as we are in, but France got out of the difficulty by doing as I now venture humbly to suggest the right hon. Gentleman should do—namely, obtain instruction from the Belleville Company itself in stoking as a fine art. Will the right hon. Gentleman do that? I feel very strongly the urgency of this matter. I believe that no other Belleville boilers ought to be put into Her Majesty's ships, but we have sixty-one ships with them, and the right hon. Gentleman should take the means open to his hand for using them to the best advantage. Let him set up a school of stoking, and send for two or three French stokers from the Belleville Company, to teach our men the art of stoking. Those men could then teach others, and in course of time we should learn to stoke the Belleville boiler. You cannot do it by leaving it to the unskilled stoker to learn it by himself, or if he should learn it in that way he will learn it too late. It may gall the pride of the right hon. Gentleman to go to France to be taught stoking, but this is a French dish, and if you wish to enjoy it you must have it done by a French cook. There is no other way. I do hope the right hon. Gentleman, in the presence of these enormous accusations—to some extent ill-founded, but largely well-founded—will immediately take means—there is not a day to be lost—to teach his stokers how to stoke the Belleville boiler. The right hon. Gentleman is to appoint a Committee of experts; they are to go to sea; they are to be shipmates——

MR. GOSCHEN: Some of them.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Some of them are to be shipmates of the Belleville boiler in order to see how it acts. I am not sure that that experience could not be obtained without any difficulty at all. I am not sure the captains and commanders of Her Majesty's Navy could not unfold to the right hon. Gentleman a tale about the Belleville boiler which would harrow the First Lord's soul. I have heard tales. I know nothing about engineering, but what struck me was constantly hearing executive officers of Her Majesty's Navy groaning and complaining of the awful job they had in getting the Belleville boilers to act properly. Will the right hon. Gentleman take any steps to ascertain the views of the executive officers of the Navy? I do not say even of the engineers, because they are in rather a false position; they have to report to the man who adopted the boiler, and who also looks after their promotion—and here let me say that I am not sure that that arrangement will not require to be looked after. I am not sure that the methods by which we design our ships and boilers do not require a great deal of overhauling. The chief engineer is an admirable person, but he is an engine driver in essence; his business is to drive an engine, not to design one.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY said the engineers were individually of the highest type of men they could possibly get.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I am not speaking of the individual engineer. This engineer has to look after the material, and keep it going. I am not quite sure that we have not entered on a new period as regards the navy. I am quite certain that the right hon. Gentleman and the Board of Admiralty come to their work with the highest determination to do the best they can for the country. No one

could have greater determination in that direction than the right hon. Gentleman, but then he is constantly being told by Navy Leagues and halfpenny newspapers that the Admiralty is an effete institution. There was a time when we were told that if steam were adopted in the Navy it would be the downfall of the Fleet, and there was also great difficulty in introducing breech-loading guns. The modern Admiral now says to himself, "I will not be open to that reproach; I will keep up to the times," and he is consequently apt to run to the other extreme and to indulge in a debauch of novelty. I regret the changes which are being made, especially as regards the training squadron, but I regret most of all the change which was made in boilers and machinery without adequate trial in 1893. I am glad the right hon. gentleman has volunteered a Committee. It was not forced upon him, and I hope it will do good work. I trust in the meantime the right hon. Gentleman will take immediate steps to increase the number of stokers for the boilers we have already got, in order that we may get better results than hitherto—such results as at any rate will make us feel comparatively safe in trusting our Navy and our sailors to the Belleville boilers.

*Mr. ALLAN: I rise with feelings of great gratification. I congratulate the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Admiralty on his patriotism in agreeing to appoint an expert Committee to inquire into the whole question of the boilering of Her Majesty's ships. That question when I entered the House six years ago came home to me. When the great plunge was made, and when millions of money were blindly thrown into the business, I saw that a mistake was being committed, and I did not hesitate to tell the then Administration that they were making a powerful mistake and a terrible blunder. The late Secretary of State to the Admiralty laughs, but he does not know what a boiler is. Probably he laughs because he has left such a legacy to his successors; but laughing will not make a strong Navy or save Britain in the hour of danger, and I do not like to see an ex-Minister laughing. We have been told to-day that the "Powerful" and the "Terrible" have done everything. But what have they done? Let the truth be known. What did the "Powerful" do going out to China? She made 1,500 miles in ten days, and although she is a boat designed to do 22 knots she has never done it. I challenge the right hon. Gentleman now to take out of Portsmouth Dockyard the "Powerful" and see if she can do 22 knots after only five months steaming. She cannot do it. Why is not a list of the defects of the "Powerful" inserted in the Memorandum? I will tell the House why. The defects are so great that the Admiralty feared to put them in. What has the "Terrible" done? She had to run from Hong Kong to Ta-ku in a grave national emergency when the lives of a British Minister and British attachés in Peking were in jeopardy. How long did she take? Did she do 22 knots? Never. She did not do 15 knots, and, forsooth, these are the boilers which were to do great things, and which the First Lord of the Admiralty, on the advice of the so-called experts, approved. But, of course, I am not blaming the right hon. Gentleman. Take the "Europa." What has she done? She was designed to do 20 knots, and she ran from Suez to Colombo at the magnificent speed of 7½ knots, and, forsooth, this ship, designed to do 20 knots, took eighty-eight days for that trip to Sydney. Why, a sailing ship would have done it in the time. It is a satire on British engineering, and on our Naval supremacy, that a ship designed to do 20 or 22 knots cannot do it. None of these ships can do it. I stand on facts. A great many hon. Members in this House have perhaps never seen a Belleville boiler. There are actually 48,000 joints connected with the boilers of H.M.S. "Glory." Think of that at the end of the nineteenth century. Shade of James Watt and George Stephenson! We are now spending millions in putting boilers into ships with 48,000 joints, when the true spirit of all engineering science ought to be simplicity, and the fewer the joints the better the job. That is the reason of their failure, and I fear that these boilers will lead to disastrous explosions which are bound to come at unexpected moments. Take the "Hermes." She was sent out to the West India station, and ere reaching it it was found that the boilers were all burnt. She was towed into Nassau, but they could not repair her there. She was then towed to Port Royal, and could not be repaired there, and had to be towed to Bermuda. What happened to her? I am quite willing to admit that the feed pumps

were a little wrong, but granted they were not working well, there was so little water left in the boilers that it evaporated in ten minutes, the boilers became red hot, the men panic stricken, and a lieutenant had to be sent down from the deck to keep the men, who were almost in a state of mutiny, in the stokehole. I feel sorry for the chief engineer. I will tell you why. His life must have been miserable. Night and day he was on duty; and, being in dread of a black mark against his name, he dared not open his mouth. He was never off watch, and when the ship got to Bermuda he was invalided home. Get his report and defects list. The "Hermes" is a fine sample of British engineering. It is a beautiful sample, and she is not fit to do a bit of work now. Take another case, the "Diadem," which we were told to-night was such a success. I have seen a letter which states that hundreds of her tubes had to be taken out—they were all pin-holed; and the letter states that if all the facts were known as to the amount the "Diadem" cost to repair they would stagger humanity. The pin-holed tubes were put into hot zinc in order to close up the holes, and then they were put back again into the boilers. I should like to show the right hon. Gentleman some facts which his officials have not laid before him. The Memorandum which has been issued is a melancholy example of misapplied engineering effort. I never read such a miserable account coming from men who call themselves engineers. Why, a three years apprentice would not have written such stuff.

MR. GOSCHEN: I must protest against the hon. Gentleman doing what he has done before. He attacks not only the scientific knowledge of the experts, but he also attacks them for not putting the facts before me. Against that I protest.

*MR. ALLAN: I am relying on the Memorandum. I have not attacked any man, and I can only judge by what is given to me. What I want to bring home to the right hon. Gentleman is that all through the Memorandum at every opportunity there is disparagement of the cylindrical boiler. What are the facts? If you compare the old "Impérieuse," fitted with the cylindrical boilers, and the modern "Diadem," with the water-tube boilers, it will be found that the first is fit for sea, can go anywhere, and is as good at her work to-day as the day she came out, and that, if pitted against the "Diadem" from here to the Cape, in a steady spin, or across the Atlantic, she would win, and on far less coals. Again, in the trials between the "Minerva" and the "Highflyer," the "Highflyer" had from forty to fifty tons of water in her tanks, whereas the "Minerva" had none. Now if the "Highflyer" had been under similar conditions to the "Minerva," it is evident that she could not have done her run at all, as she required this water for her water-tube boilers, while the "Minerva" required none for her cylindrical boilers; this was not pointed out in the Memorandum. Then there is the case of the "Pegasus," fitted with water-tube boilers. She had been for fifteen months on commission on the South American station; and what has happened? The water-tube boilers have to be refitted and she is ordered home, and the "Sappho," with cylindrical boilers, was sent to take her place. How much steaming has the "Pegasus" done altogether? I question if she has done two months, and then you send out a cylindrical boilered ship to take her place. Why did you not send out any other water-tube boilered ship, if the "Pegasus" had proved satisfactory? The idea of the Admiralty officials as to the value of water-tube boilers is absurd and cannot be borne out by facts. Even on the chief engineer's admission there is no saving in weight, although he says that there is a gain in speed. Speed is a matter of form, displacement, and power, and not a matter of the type of boiler, and to say that you can get a knot more because of a certain type of boiler, is a piece of engineering bluff. We are told by Members of this House that these boilers have come to stay; but if they have come to stay, the engineer critic has come to stay also, and will stay as long as they remain, and until the existing evils are removed. When we talk of this country, of which we all are proud, what do we see? That from the old boiler has arisen all our country's greatness. It has built up our present mercantile supremacy, and has carried our Army with all its impedimenta to South Africa. Of the 240 or 250 transport steamers employed for the war, not one was fitted with water-tube boilers.

Now the country's first line of defence is provided with boilers which are not to be depended on, while for simplicity, economy, and the peace of mind of the engineering staff nothing can equal the cylindrical boilers. The cylindrical boiler has made Britain what it is, and if they are not used in our Navy, so as to give us a sure superiority over other nations, then I say farewell to the greatness of Britain on the seas. Once her naval power is destroyed, she will go down as did Carthage of old.

ADMIRAL FIELD (Sussex, Eastbourne): We have had the usual protest from the hon. Member for Gateshead against water-tube boilers, and I wish now to draw the attention of the Committee away from that subject. The hon. Member, who appears to have water-tube boilers on the brain, laboured the question, but now that the First Lord of the Admiralty has granted a Committee, which I regret has been granted at all, we may pass from the subject. It is not true that these boilers were not tested. They were very well tested by engineers of standing, who took passages on vessels fitted with these boilers to and from Australia and reported on them. I cannot agree with my hon. friend the Member for King's Lynn, that France is discarding the Belleville type. France is using two or three kinds of water-tube boilers, and let us do the same. Russia has also taken up water-tube boilers for the fleet she is now building, and it is all nonsense for hon. Members in this House to find fault with the policy of the Admiralty because they have adopted a boiler which has failed in a few ships. My hon. friend the Member for King's Lynn made some very useful observations. I would remind the House that we have never taken up a new invention without encountering difficulties. I remember when steam was first introduced and there was then great difficulty, but we did not discard steam. I remember also when rifles were introduced for the first time, but we did not throw them overboard. Neither will we throw over these water-tube boilers. It is all nonsense for hon. Members to make theatrical protests in this House in this age of reform and progress. If the House wants an illustration of the advantages of a water-tube boiler, let them turn to page 15 of the Memorandum, where it is stated—

"The advantage of quickly raising steam was illustrated in the case of the 'Niobe' at Las Palmas, when the 'Persia' transport broke her shaft, and was nearly on the rocks. The 'Niobe' was able to get up steam and go to her assistance in 1¾ hours from the time of receiving the news. With cylindrical boilers it would have required five or six hours."

The First Lord has granted a Committee. I regret it, because it is a concession to clamour without much backing behind it. However, the right hon. Gentleman has granted it, and there is nothing more to be said. Let me pass away from that subject, and let me say how pleased I am at the Supplementary Estimate which has been introduced, and that the First Lord and his advisers have decided on these new torpedo boat destroyers and also on the repairing ships. All this is most meritorious, and makes up for the shortcomings in the fulfilment of the Admiralty programme for the past year. I agree with much that has been said by the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean, who always speaks with great weight on this subject, and no civilian has studied the question more closely than he has. I agree with what he says about the shipbuilding programme being thrown into arrears because firms take foreign contracts which pay them better. This is a vital matter. We have no right to run any risks, and I do not think that any adequate defence has been made by the Admiralty for the non-fulfilment of their programme. The engineers' strike no doubt explains part of it, but that is not sufficient justification. I stated the facts to a friend outside this House who is conversant with the subject in all its bearings, and he used language of the most un-Parliamentary character. He intimated plainly that the statements which were made in this House were not in accordance with facts. The matter is so vital to this Empire that I would do anything in my power to prevent foreign contracts being placed in this country as long as our own naval programme was unfinished. If an Act of Parliament were introduced to check the execution of foreign contracts in this country when our own contracts are left behind, I would vote for it. We are behind France with our building programme, although we have had some extension through the pressure of the public press. I have been much impressed with the important experi-

ments of a crucial character made on the Belleisle." Of course no one is allowed to go on board, but anyone can go into the dockyard, and by merely looking at the vessel there and judging for one's-self, one cannot fail to be struck with what the result would be of the next naval engagement. Nothing in these Estimates can make a proper provision for a reserve of battleships and armoured cruisers. We are very deficient indeed in cruisers. The late Sir George Hornby laid down what would be a sufficient number of cruisers, but the Admiralty are following his advice much too slowly. We are told that the programme presented to us is equal to that of any two Powers. That is not a proper comparison at all. Bother other flags! Our Navy should be equal in battleships, cruisers, and every other vessel of war to our Imperial necessities and our great responsibilities. A distinguished Admiral in high command, at a public banquet the other day, spoke out his mind freely before the country, and said that we are greatly deficient in battleships and cruisers. I am speaking not my own opinion, which may be worth nothing, but that of one whose views are entitled to weight and respect, and I do not hesitate to say that the Admiralty are behind the times; and woe be unto any nation that is not prepared when the hour of trial comes upon it. I am well aware that the First Lord of the Admiralty is deeply convinced of the necessities of the case, and I know that he possesses the confidence of the Service in all its branches; but that does not make me shut my eyes blindly to the facts. Our programme is not completed, and the money voted by this House has not been expended. We are in arrears, and will be in arrears. I would like to have referred to the turbine ship "Viper," which has developed a speed of forty-three miles an hour. That is marvellous, and I would like to know whether the Admiralty have it in their mind to extend that system of propulsion. The "Belleisle" experiments must have taught the Admiralty the enormous importance of more largely adopting electric power in all our battleships and cruisers for working the guns and other machinery which now require to be worked by steam power. In these days, with steam worked at 250 lb. to 300 lb. pressure, if a steam pipe were cut by shot or shell, the result would be very serious indeed. Electric power is very largely adopted in the American Navy for working the turrets and all the other machinery, and I hope the Admiralty will in that respect follow the example of the United States. Wires can be carried all over the ship out of sight, and are not likely to be injured in the hour of battle. In conclusion, I may say that I do not share the views uttered in this House by the opponents of water-tube boilers, and I, for one, regret the appointment of the Committee, although I have no doubt that the result of the inquiry will be the triumphant success of these boilers.

MR. C. H. WILSON (Hull, W.): I think I ought, having had more, perhaps, practical experience of the working of water-tube boilers at sea than any other member of the House, to give to the House the results of that experience, which certainly do not bear out the violent charges made by the hon. Member for Gateshead. I do not think we have gone far enough back in this story. When this patent was introduced into the Navy a difficulty had arisen in regard to the old cylindrical boilers in making them strong enough and heavy enough to do their work. It might have been a mistaken policy on the part of the Board of Admiralty, but I was under the impression that the cylindrical boilers in the old ships of war would not have passed the requirements of the Board of Trade for mercantile steamers. If that be so, it may account for some of the difficulties which arose from the use of the cylindrical boilers. The Admiralty, therefore, may have thought that something might be done with water-tube boilers, which were then coming to the front, and were being used in foreign navies. About the same time this country became subject to one of these constantly recurring scares as to the sufficiency of our naval defence, which every now and again make their way into the House of Commons. The Government of the day were pressed to build more ships as speedily as possible, and even to-night we have had hon. Members below the gangway complaining that they still do not build vessels fast enough. That is not a fault confined to the Admiralty. We in the mercantile marine cannot get our ships built up to time. Our experience is that when we order ships to be built by a certain time the shipbuilders take almost double the contract period, or at least make a very

considerable addition to it; so that the Admiralty, after all, may not be so much at fault as some hon. Gentlemen allege. Water-tube boilers forced themselves on the attention of the Admiralty to remedy several of the evils of the old cylindrical boilers. Then the Belleville boiler, in a way, became the fashion, with its high-sounding name; and, even after the Admiralty Memorandum has been pulled to pieces, it has been shown that, at great expense, many of the foreign Admiralties are using these Belleville boilers. The use of the water-tube boiler at sea is a new thing, but on land it was not new. Hon. Members on this side of the House have had many years experience of water-tube boilers, although I am not at the moment going to refer to any special water-tube boilers. When the Admiralty once embarked on the use of water-tube boilers, after the country and the House drove them forward to build more ships as quickly as possible, they had no time to make experiments with different classes of water-tube boilers. Even now, after so many years experience, I personally have been almost gratified to find, from the Memorandum of the Admiralty, that matters are not so bad as they might be. That is faint praise; but what has struck me is that perhaps the Admiralty practice has been somewhat lax in their designing and supervision of construction, not of the boilers only, but of the machinery of the ships on which the success of the boilers more or less depends. If the machinery gives way, or there are leakages and other faults, these react on the boilers, and do not give them the fair chance they ought to have. I think the Admiralty practice must have been considerably at fault when we see the long list of defects published in this Memorandum. Last year I was told by the captain of one of the ships of the Mediterranean Squadron that the feed-pipes were so bad that they could not keep the boilers supplied with water; and consequently, if the ship had encountered bad weather, there would have been great danger of her loss, leaving out of the question altogether the fighting capabilities of the ship. Again, these defects are not confined to the Admiralty ships alone. The same faults are to be found in the mercantile marine, partly on account of the latest forms of machinery both in naval and mercantile ships. No doubt this increase of pressure has created these difficulties. I was told the other day by a naval captain that the French naval authorities avoid to a great extent many of the faults which are shown in this Admiralty Memorandum by not working their ships at the full pressure which the boilers are capable of. If that be so, the French ships might develop the same faults under similar conditions. It is constantly being asked why do not these ships steam at the highest speeds; and complaints are made that they do not. I imagine that the Admiralty authorities in too many instances, in their attempts to attain these highest speeds, have worked the machinery, for long distances too, at a greater pressure than is desirable or wise on their part. Take the experience of my own firm. To some extent we found the same faults with the old cylindrical boilers which the Admiralty did; and we have in the same way asked ourselves how these things could be remedied. Water-tube boilers were brought before us eight years ago, and one was put in the ship called "Nero," which has been continuously at work ever since. How many thousands of joints it has I do not know, but practically they have given us no trouble. I will give our experience with water-tube boilers, in the hope that it may be of some interest to the House, to the Admiralty, and likewise, possibly, to the country, because a scare has arisen that these water-tube boilers are inefficient, and that we are likely to have the terrible catastrophes predicted by my hon. friend the Member for Gateshead. In 1893 we got to work with the "Nero," and since then she has made seventy-nine voyages, and run 165,965 knots. In 1895 we built the steamer called the "Hero."

COMMANDER BETHELL (Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness): Were these fitted with the Belleville boilers?

MR. C. H. WILSON: No; they were fitted with Babcock's English water-tube boilers. The "Hero" made 257 voyages out and home, that is from Hull to continental ports and back again, and ran 131,045 knots. In 1896 we took the old cylindrical boilers out of another of our steamers in the same way as we had done with the "Nero," and put in water-tube boilers in her; and she has made 104 voyages, and run 106,293 knots. In 1897 we did the same thing with

e "Orlando," which has made sixty-ight voyages, and run 84,306 knots. n 1898 the old cylindrical boilers were ken out of the "Rollo," and water-tube oilers substituted, and she has made rty-nine voyages, and run 53,975 knots. n 1898 the "Otto" was built for the hort weekly continental trade, and was tted with water-tube boilers. She has ade ninety-nine voyages, and run 1,984 knots. In the same year e "Duello," a new vessel, was tted with water-tube boilers. She as made ninety-four voyages, and run 1,291 knots. In 1899 the cylindrical oilers were taken out of the "Tasso," nd water-tube boilers put in. She has ade twenty-seven voyages, and run 4,046 knots. This steamer makes requent voyages from Hull to the West oast of Norway, and carries a great any of our friends backward and for-ard with perfect safety. Summing up he results of all these steamers, I find hat they have made 800 voyages and un 700,000 knots, and practically we ave not experienced all the dangers and difficulties that have been predicted. I do ot say that the water-tube boilers are erfect. As we go on we get more know-edge, the same as the Admiralty are getting; and we are now getting as near perfect as possible. We have steamers running to America once a week, and we are taking the cylindrical boilers out of hem and putting in water-tube boilers. n a few weeks they would be running a voyage of 7,000 miles, and that will give a very good test. Taking the other side of the question, in 1895 we had Belleville oilers put into the "Ohio," but they were not satisfactory, and we took them out after runs of 111,000 knots to America and back. These were the first Belleville boilers constructed by Moles-worth so far as the mercantile marine is concerned; and possibly they were not a fair test of the system. No doubt the experience of the Admiralty has been somewhat unsatisfactory; but at the same time I think the Admiralty deserves the greatest credit for taking up this great question, and not allowing it to be-come a matter of party politics—one Government blaming another for doing this or not doing the other thing. I hope the appointment of this Committee, which I am glad the Admi-ralty has promised, will lead to satis-factory results. Personally I feel con-vinced that the Admiralty will never go back again to the use of cylindrical boilers. I have heard it stated from the other side of the House, by the hon. Member for Gateshead, that there is no saving in the weight by the use of water-tube boilers. That is a great mistake. There is an enormous saving in weight. The hon. Member is correct when he says that the weight of the water-tube boiler itself is not less than that of the cylindri-cal. But he omits altogether the enor-mous weight of the water in the cylindrical boilers as compared with that in the water-tube boilers; and it is self-evident that that is a very great advan-tage, more especially in the Navy. But even in the case of the mercantile marine, as a practical ship-owner, I think it is a great advantage. Take one of our smaller ships: there is a saving of twenty tons of water. And if that ship makes fifty trips from Hull to the Continent and back, that is 100 in all. They could, by the use of water-tube boilers, carry 5,000 tons more cargo. This advantageous saving of weight the Admiralty could put into guns or engines. Personally, I think they ought to put it into guns, because I have been told that French men-of-war are better armed than our English ships. I understand that the Ad-miralty utilise the saving in weight by taking in more coal, instead of in-creasing the defensive and offensive power of the ships. But in the Boer war we have found that the range of guns is all-important; and I hope that those Gentlemen who are responsible for the Navy will take a lesson from that, and increase the armament rather than the coals. It would be much better if they carried their coal with them in colliers, and so made our ships more efficient than those of any other country. What I have said I hope will be taken for what it is worth. It is my opinion against that of hon. Members who have always taken an opposite view. I repeat that our first steamer fitted with water-tube boilers eight years ago is yet at work, and we have no reason to com-plain of it. I presume, therefore, I can speak with a certain amount of authority on this subject. If my experience tends in any way to allay the scare which has been excited in this country in regard to this matter, I feel that I shall have done what little I could to assist the Admiralty in what, no doubt, is a very

difficult position, but which it is the duty of the House to make as easy as possible for them.

SIR EDWARD GOURLEY (Sunderland) said his hon. friend the Member for Hull, in alluding to water-tube boilers——

Attention called to the fact that forty Members were not present (Dr. TANNER, Cork Co., Mid). House counted, and forty Members being found present,

SIR EDWARD GOURLEY (continuing) said the Memorandum which had just been issued by the Admiralty to hon. Members dealt entirely with boilers of the Belleville type. There was no charge against the manufacturers of such boilers as were made by Messrs. Babcock and Wilcox. In regard to vessels fitted with water-tube boilers the main charge was that the amount of speed for which they were originally designed had never been attained in a single vessel, and the Memorandum, to his mind, with regard to the performances of this type of boiler was neither more nor less than a piece of special pleading. The Memorandum commenced by admitting an enormous number of defects in connection with this type of boiler, and the reason assigned in the Memorandum for the defects not having been remedied and overcome in the long series—he might say years—of experiments was want of knowledge and ability on the part of the engineers and artificers who man the engine-room. That was, to his mind, an unnecessary reflection upon the engineers employed by the Admiralty, and so far from this type of boiler being complex and difficult to superintend, he believed that nothing was so easily managed. He had himself gone into the boiler-rooms of the "Powerful," and an explanation was given to him by the engineers. He saw nothing whatever difficult in connection with the manning and working of these boilers, the defect being not in the management but in connection with the type of boiler itself. Owing to the many defects in these boilers which had been developed in the course of time a much larger staff was required for superintending and doing the work of the vessels generally, and thus the vessels must be much more expensive to work than vessels fitted with the cylindrical type of boiler. With regard to the experiments on the two ships referred to in the Memorandum—the "Highflyer" and the "Minerva"—he found that there had been no fewer than fourteen defects in the "Highflyer," which had the Belleville type of boiler, whereas in the "Minerva," which had cylindrical boilers, there were only three defects. He believed that during four trials of sixty hours at a time, the "Minerva" had to be detained twice while the defects of the "Highflyer" were being repaired. In connection with the Report just issued there was one serious omission on the part of the Admiralty, no allusion being made to the great heat connected with the working of this type of boiler. From the reports which had been received from the engineers and others it appeared that the men in the stokehold were sometimes entirely incapacitated for work. In hot climates, such as the Red Sea and other places, where the heat was great, extra hands had to be employed—Zanzibar men—who were accustomed to work in great heat. He could prove what he had said with regard to the great heat in the use of these boilers by calling attention to what was proposed to be done. It was proposed to introduce an eight-inch lining of silicate of cotton in order to cool and make the cabins habitable. In regard to the new yacht, he held that the Chief Constructor of the Navy, instead of designing the vessel in the office of the Admiralty, ought, as any shipbuilder would have done in building a yacht for his own use, to have called in the assistance of a naval architect accustomed to the designing and building of yachts. It was perfectly evident from the construction of the "Victoria and Albert" that the ability to build yachts did not exist at the Admiralty. We had not yet been told what the extra cost was to be of pulling that vessel to pieces.

THE CHAIRMAN: That question does not arise on this Vote. This Vote that we are now discussing refers to what is built under contract for Her Majesty's Government.

SIR EDWARD GOURLEY said the reason assigned for the adoption of this type of boiler was that it was less weight than the cylindrical boiler. That was perfectly true. He believed that the difference in weight in favour of the Belleville boilers was 100 tons in favour

of the "Highflyer" as compared with the "Minerva." But what about the fuel? On that point there was no information in the Memorandum which had been placed before them; but on page 26 of the Report they had the performances given of vessels with the Belleville type of boiler and four ships with cylindrical boilers. One of the vessels with the Belleville type of boiler made a continuous run from the Nore to Gibraltar, a distance of 1,330 miles. During the run she consumed 950 tons of coal, whereas a cylindrical boiler ship, in a run of 1,298 miles, consumed only 569 tons of coal. Supposing both of these vessels had gone a distance of 3,000 miles, the result would have been, in regard to the "Diadem," a consumption of something like 2,150 tons, while the consumption in the case of the "Royal Arthur" would not have amounted to more than 1,500 tons—a difference of about 600 tons in favour of the vessel fitted with cylindrical boilers. It would be admitted that coal meant displacement, and that a vessel which required 2,000 tons compared badly with another vessel which required 1,500 tons—a difference of 500 tons. On a voyage across the Atlantic the difference would be 400 tons. That was a most serious defect in connection with the Belleville type of boiler. In regard to this type of boiler the First Lord of the Admiralty said that the performances of their vessels were not to be compared with those of the mercantile marine. Were our cruisers to be treated as though they were toys? These vessels, when completed and ready for sea, ought to be sent on a continuous voyage of five, six, or seven days, in the same way as ships owned by large companies. We adopted a different method in regard to the so-called trial system; but we would never arrive at a correct estimate of the speed of our men-of-war until we adopted another method. He came now to another point, and that was the policy with regard to the strength of the Navy. The policy laid down by both parties in the State was that the Navy of this country, both with respect to ships and guns, should be equal to that of two other maritime Powers—France and Russia. That was the policy laid down by the late and the previous Government. Whether it was the policy of the present Government it was impossible to tell. In 1889 this country had 36 battleships afloat and 15 building; 12 coast defence ships; 12 armoured cruisers; and 86 protected cruisers; whilst France and Russia in the same year had only 25 battleships afloat, and 12 building. At the end of 1899—ten years later—this country had only 34 battleships afloat, and 17 building—a total of 51; whilst France and Russia had 34 battleships afloat, and 16 building—a total of 50, or only one less than this country possessed. If our policy was to have two to one, it thus appeared that both with respect to battleships and cruisers we were considerably short of the number required. He believed that the men-of-war of other countries were fitted with electrical hoists for facilitating the rapid handling of munitions in time of war, and he could not see why similar facilities should not be provided on our ships. He hoped the Committee of Inquiry would be appointed quickly, and that the Admiralty would ascertain as early as possible all the facts in connection with the different types of boiler.

*SIR J. COLOMB: In view of the fact that the First Lord of the Admiralty has announced his intention of having a Committee, I do not wish to occupy the time of the House with any expression of my own opinion, except to say that I think it was absolutely inevitable that the water-tube principle should be adopted. The question of the suitability of the Belleville boiler, or any other type, is an open question, but I would like to have some definite information from the First Lord in regard to the producing power of this country. I think it is an extremely serious thing when we have adopted the principle of two to one. It is not a scientific standard. What is there to begin with? The Navy consists of several classes of vessels. You cannot lump the whole question, and say that if Russia and France—the two greatest maritime Powers next to us—have so many battleships and cruisers, therefore we can adjust scientifically the arrangements of our Fleet. But even taking this standard of two to one, to be told that we cannot complete our ships to attain our standard is a most serious position, because these ships were projected to keep up our strength to that standard. What is the use of having a standard if our arrangements for producing ships and engines are insufficient to keep up that standard itself? When the Navy Estimates were formerly

before us I asked a question to which I did not get an answer; but perhaps the right hon. Gentleman will answer now. I wish to know what steps are being taken as regards the development of our producing power. I am not at all sure that our naval intelligence staff are observing as completely and efficiently as they ought to do what other Powers are doing. If other Powers are increasing their plant and arrangements for greater producing power, it would be interesting to know what we are doing in that direction. To my mind that is really the root of the whole question. I do not remember myself—I may be wrong—in the whole history of this country of its ever having been announced before in this House, that although ships are projected and necessary, we were not able to complete them. I am sure the Admiralty has done its best to push on these matters, but you cannot increase your producing power in a hurry. It is a matter of settled policy that requires a long time to develop, and if they have done all that they can it is not to be laid to the door of the Administration of this particular time that the position is not more satisfactory. It shows that there has been a continuous defect in carrying out the policy, and in making the necessary arrangements for developing the producing power. I will not go into the question of *personnel* now as I have a motion down to reduce the salary of the First Lord, and I will defer my remarks on that matter until the time comes to move. I have also a motion down to reduce the Vote in respect of £62,000 for subventions of the merchant service. I shall not move that, because we are in the midst of great transport operations, and I do not think it is opportune to go into a question of policy which is now under test in a practical way, and as far as I know the present experience is justifying my persistent opposition to this subvention principle on its present lines.

MR. HARWOOD (Bolton): I wish to call the attention of the Committee to another matter, and that is the attitude of the Admiralty towards the question of submarine or submersible boats. I can only ground my complaints upon answers which have been given across the floor of the House, and it is quite possible that it may be a matter of necessity that those answers should not be more explicit. The first answer is that of the First Lord of the Admiralty to the hon. Member for West Newington—

> "The submarine boat, even if the practical difficulties attending its use can be overcome, seems so far as the immediate future is concerned, to be essentially a weapon for maritime Powers on the defensive, and it is natural that those nations which anticipate holding that position should endeavour to develop it."

The second answer is one in reply to a question I put asking whether the Admiralty were conducting any experiments in regard to these submarine boats; the reply was that they were not doing so, but were watching the experiments of other nations. As far as we can judge, the attitude of the Admiralty is that they are not doing anything themselves in the way of experiments, but they are watching the experiments of others. I venture frankly to say that the point of view from which I approach this matter is that of the business man. I think that, perhaps, Admiralty and naval matters are left rather too much to the discussion of experts and Members for naval constituencies. Who, after all, are the most interested in the Navy? The people who pay most for it, and they are the productive classes of the community. We, if I may number myself among them, are the most interested, because we contribute so largely towards it, and depend so much upon it. Who would suffer most if we lost the supremacy of the sea? In a material sense the productive classes of the community. Therefore it is the manufacturing classes who are most interested in the Navy being kept up to the highest possible point of efficiency. I want to look at the matter from the point of view of the plain business man, and I say from that point of view the attitude of the Admiralty is indefensible. I do not at all assume that there is anything in the scheme. I am quite prepared to grant, for the sake of argument, that ultimately it may be found that there is nothing in it. But that is not a sufficient reply. If you are conducting a great business—and there is no greater business than that of the Navy—you must not only be the first in production, you must also be the first in experimenting. In my own small way, if people about me are not experimenting when other people are experimenting, I blame them very considerably; I say they are neglecting their duty. You do not know what may come of experiments.

It is quite possible that the circumstances at present may not be hopeful or clear; but it is also more than possible that by conducting these experiments you will find out something which will be of enormous use. Therefore, my complaint is not to be answered by saying that these things will not succeed. My question is: Are you taking up the position you ought to take up as the head of a great business? Are you showing that enterprise and zeal and forwardness that are demanded by your position? Is there anything in this matter? Take the answer of the First Lord himself. He says the boat might be useful to nations on the defensive. But that plan of putting nations into two categories—those on the defensive, and those on the offensive—is illogical. Take a nation with a Navy like ours, spread all over the world. If any war breaks out, we shall be in some places on the offensive, but in some places also we shall be on the defensive. The matter will not be settled by some great naval Armageddon in which the great navies of the world will sail out into the open sea and fight each other until only one is left. As we have found in the present land war in South Africa, in some places we are superior, and in some places we are inferior; therefore, to say that because on the whole we are superior, and that other nations will have to be on the defensive with regard to us, does not prove that we should not take every possible precaution to have every appliance that is useful for defence, as well as for offence. I was, therefore, astonished at the apparent assumption underlying that answer, because to say that we are the nation on the offensive, and that other nations are on the defensive, is a very partial and, if I may say so, untrue view of the matter. If there is in the idea anything that is useful for defence, there must be an element of usefulness of which we ought to take advantage. The First Lord of the Admiralty in the same answer said—

"The question of the best way"

—and this is an acknowledgment that there is something in these boats—

"of meeting its attack is receiving much consideration, and it is in this direction that practical suggestions will be valuable."

Then there is something in the attack; otherwise there would be no need of anything to meet that attack. You fear it; you are giving your mind to considering how that attack should be met. Why are you not giving your mind to the consideration of the means of attack, as well as to the means of defence against that attack? There is another point to which I should like to call the attention of the Committee, and that is as to the course taken by other countries in reference to this matter. Is there anything in it at all? Is it a mere idle dream, or does there lie in it the germ of something useful? I think there does. The right hon. Gentleman referred in most eloquent terms to the lofty English scorn that some people show in regard to looking to foreign nations for examples. But anybody who has in the least degree studied the history of naval matters knows that France has been ahead of us in a great many things. I would remind the right hon. Gentleman that in regard not only to breech-loading guns, but to armour plate, the application of steam to ships of war, and to rams—in all these things the French were ahead of us. Therefore, whenever the French do anything it behoves us to look at it seriously, because they have been pioneers in these matters, and anyone who reads the debates in the French House of Commons on naval questions knows in what detail and with what keenness these matters are discussed, not merely from the point of view of getting higher wages for some particular class of men, but from the point of view of general national and naval policy. I therefore contend that the example of France in this matter is deserving of the serious attention of the Admiralty and of the country. The French are not only not doubtful about the matter, but they are absolutely certain that there is something in this idea which is or may be made very valuable. They built in 1888 the "Gymmote," the "Gustave Zédé" in 1893, the "Morse" in 1899, and the "Narval" in 1899. The "Narval" is under trial and is a success, realising up to a certain point the autonomous and offensive submarine. On the stocks are six submarines, all, it would seem, of the "Morse" type, and these are the "Français"—they are even named; this is no mere chimera, they have names—the "Français," the "Algerien," the "Korrigan," the "Farfadet," the "Gnome," and the "Lutin." Two improved "Narvals" are being built. I find also in the plan of the manœuvres, which are attract-

ing so much attention now, that the submarines "Narval" and "Morse" will go through exercises, diving and reappearing on the surface, during the review. All this shows that in France this matter has got beyond the stage of a mere dream, and therefore I say that in England it has certainly reached a stage deserving experiment. There may be a certain amount of national excitability to which we are rather fond of thinking ourselves superior, but the French people have subscribed 300,000fr. to present one of these boats to the nation, and the French seven years programme includes the building of thirty-eight submarine boats. M. Lockroy, the Minister of Marine, has described most carefully the action of one of these submarine boats which sailed from Turin to Marseilles, and which in eight minutes practically sunk the "Magenta" ship. The Committee must remember that when you sink a battleship you sink forty to one in the way of value alone, because a battleship costs forty times as much as one of these boats. In the last parliamentary debate on the French Naval Estimates the Reporter of Navy Estimates said :—

"The submarine vessels are now proved to be so valuable that a large number should be at once provided."

But we are not confined to France. It is only to-day that we have heard that France and the United States were the two countries whose example was most to be looked to. What do the United States say? They too have taken up this matter. I am sorry to say I am old enough to remember how much depends upon being ahead in these matters. Some Members will remember when the "Merrimac" came out; it was a new development—a development we should have laughed at in this House and which the Admiralty would have thought not worth experimenting about. But it was an experiment which would have sunk the whole fleet of the Northern States if they had not had another experiment—the "Monitor.' That departure has revolutionised naval warfare, and therefore there is something in these matters. There have appeared in our papers pictures of the Holland boat. It is not an experiment even in its early stages; it is worked out to the most minute nicety. You have an arrangement of electric motor power for travelling under the water; of gas power for searching; you get a speed of eight knots under the water, and of fifteen knots on the surface. I saw it stated that the United States are to add fifty of these vessels to their fleet. The Naval Department of America has been considering this matter very seriously, and Admiral Dewey, who will not be thought a mean authority, was examined on the question. He appeared before the House of Representatives Committee on Naval Affairs when the subject was discussed. He told the Committee he had witnessed the test of the Holland boat, and greatly admired its performance. He was convinced that if the Spaniards had had two Holland boats in Manila Bay he could never have remained there. The two nations that have been held up to us this afternoon by the First Lord of the Admiralty as the countries which pre-eminently claim our attention are the two nations who are not merely experimenting in this matter but are actually building these boats. I should not dwell so much upon this matter, but it is not an occasional lapse on the part of the Admiralty; it is an instance of a chronic disease. In these things we have always been behind, and we are going to be behind again. I do not say that nothing is certain to come out of the experiments, but what I do say is that the present course of the Admiralty does not indicate that they are realising their duties as managers of a great business upon which depends the welfare and safety of a great nation. To me it is astounding that we should be behind anyone in experimenting with anything in any direction that can throw any light whatever upon any improvement in this great business upon which so much depends. I do not pretend in the least to be an expert, but I do say that the Admiralty are taking up a wrong position in this matter. In conclusion, I would ask the Committee to consider the moral effect of always being in front. As a business man I have learnt that it is not merely the actual results of your experiments that are of value, but that your people know that no one is ever ahead of you, that you are always in the front in trying things, and this gives rise to a feeling of hopefulness and trust which cannot be obtained in any other way. There is also the moral effect of these vessels themselves. I cannot imagine anything more weird, uncanny, or more likely to strike fear into the hearts of your enemies than the gliding about

of a vessel under water, which may at any moment send them to the bottom. There is the uncertainty, the invisibility, and the weirdness of the thing, which have a fearful moral effect upon your opponents, which is probably far exceeding the effect of anything actually done by the boat. I plead with the right hon. Gentleman, who has shown such a spirit of patriotism and enterprise, that in this matter, as in other matters, he will see that the British Admiralty and Navy are really in front of all the nations of the world.

*CAPTAIN PHILLPOTTS (Devonshire, Torquay): Like many other hon. Members in this House I do not pretend to be able to give an authoritative opinion upon the vexed question of water-tube boilers; that is a question to be threshed out by a committee of experts. But there is one subject in connection with water-tube boilers upon which I do venture to offer an opinion, and that is the complement of artificers, and especially in regard to these boilers. We have only to read the Memorandum which has been supplied to us to see that many of the accidents which have occurred have been due to want of efficiency and to the lack of proper inspection and manipulation of these complicated engines. When I tell the Committee that the complement of artificers on cruisers of the "Highflyer" class is only nine, it will be enough to show that that complement is not sufficient to carry out the important duties demanded from the engine-room staff. One hon. Member opposite told us that there were 48,000 joints in connection with these boilers and the machinery, with a steam pressure of between 250 and 300 pounds to the square inch. That means that every single artificer has over 5,300 joints with which to occupy his spare time. I say to occupy his "spare time," because he has his watch to keep, and in addition to his duties in the engine-room, the artificers and engineers have to look after the auxiliary engines, the electric light engine, and the thousand and one complicated machines that exist on board Her Majesty's ships. I therefore assert, without hesitation, that there is not a single engineer or executive officer in the Navy who will say that the engine-room complement is anything like sufficient, and I hope my right hon. friend will take immediate steps to remedy that state of things. I am quite aware of the difficulty of engaging skilled artificers; but, after all, the question of engaging men of that class is more or less a matter of money; and I am quite certain that this Committee, if called upon, will ungrudgingly vote the necessary funds to provide additional or increased pay if such be demanded in order to get the proper number of men to attend to the work of the engines and boilers of these vessels. I am not referring to ships fitted with cylindrical boilers. Their complement is about the same, but the work is not nearly so hard, and the men have a much better chance of properly carrying out their duties. There are undoubtedly many great advantages in connection with water-tube boilers, most of which are pointed out in the Memorandum; but there is one advantage which may fairly be claimed for them which is not alluded to—namely, the fact of the machinery being below the water-line. Recently I had an opportunity of seeing the drawings of two ships of exactly the same class—the "Talbot" and the "Highflyer" class. The "Talbot" was a very successful ship, getting up her speed and doing her work most efficiently, but her cylinders are 4 feet above the water-line, and have to be protected by a steel dome; whereas in the ship of the same size of the "Highflyer" class they are all under one steel deck, which does not come above the water-line. Gentlemen who have experience only of mail steamers and passenger ships do not realise the difference of the conditions that prevail on board Her Majesty's ships. Several speakers have wondered why our fast cruisers cannot keep up their speed on a voyage across the Atlantic. They are never intended to do anything of the kind. They are designed and intended to keep up their high rate of speed for chasing, or, in emergency, avoiding an enemy. They are not intended to make a voyage at that speed, and it would be perfectly impossible with existing conditions to design a ship with all the necessary qualities of a man-of-war which could do such work. I will in a very few words endeavour to illustrate my meaning. Take the case of the "Terrible," a vessel of 14,000 tons, and the "Campania," one of the most successful of ocean mail steamers, of a slightly less tonnage. The length of the "Campania" is somewhere about 100 feet greater than that of the "Terrible";

her amidship section is very much less, and there is no necessity to keep her engines below the water-line, as they are not exposed to shell fire. It is perfectly evident to anyone who is acquainted with the operations of designing a ship that it is impossible to get the same speed in a short broad boat that you can in a long narrow one, unless you devote the whole space to the engines and boilers, and that obviously would be impossible in a man-of-war. We also hear a great deal about the expenditure of coal in connection with some of our men-of-war, but the fact is often lost sight of that an enormous amount of coal is expended in connection with the auxiliary engines, the engines for working the turrets, for electric lighting purposes, ventilating, and other matters. So far it has not been found possible to obviate the increased waste that occurs when steam leaves the boilers at a very high pressure, and a certain amount of the additional expenditure on water-tube boilers may be accounted for in that way. For my part, I believe that the boiler of the future will be some form of water-tube boiler, and I think that the results of the labours of this Committee which is to be appointed will be of the very greatest use to the country. I now turn to another subject. I notice in the Navy Estimates this year provision is made for the construction of several armoured and protected cruisers. I wish to draw the attention of the First Lord of the Admiralty to the armaments it is proposed to place on board those ships. Take the armaments of the armoured cruisers of 9,800 tons. I find that they consist of fourteen 6-inch guns, which is a very much lighter armament than would be placed upon a cruiser of anything like that tonnage built by any foreign Power. I find in the "Ariadne" class, which are vessels of 11,000 tons, the armament consists of sixteen 6-inch guns. I contend that that is a mistake. What is the use of designing your ships for coal-carrying capacity and a high rate of speed when, within range of the enemy, they may find themselves hopelessly outclassed? I am well aware that there are many persons whose opinion is worthy of the highest respect, who hold that these armaments are sufficient, and that nothing should be sacrificed in the shape of coal-carrying capacity in order to increase those armaments, and yet I venture to say that the mass of naval opinion, and the opinion of officers who will have the command of these ships, would be in favour of supplying them with guns of greater power and calibre than the proposed armament. I would ask my right hon. friend to consider this point before those vessels get too far advanced to alter their armour. Once the construction is so far advanced alterations can only be made by a very great sacrifice of time, money, and material, and in the opinion of vast numbers of naval officers, it is essential that this matter should be considered before the vessels are further advanced. There is another point in connection with this subject of which I would remind the Committee. Speaking broadly, the power of penetration of the gun is equal to about one and a half times its calibre. Therefore, a 6-inch gun would penetrate nine inches of armour, and a 9·2-inch gun would penetrate nearly fourteen inches of armour. We see from the reports not only of our own ironclads, but of the ironclads being built by foreign nations, that they profess to attain a speed of nineteen knots. It is easy to imagine that one of our heavy cruisers might be pursued by an enemy's battleship so near her own speed that she might be placed in a very awkward position; whereas if she carried a couple of 9·2-inch guns in a turret aft, it would probably make all the difference between escape and capture. I beg to submit this suggestion to my right hon. friend in the hope that he will give it his further consideration. I now come to the question of the experiments of the "Belleisle." I have read some of the criticisms and accounts of those experiments which have appeared in the public press. According to some people's ideas one would imagine that it was supposed that any ship which ever had been designed could have kept afloat after being subjected to the terrific fire which was opened upon the "Belleisle." I venture to say that there is not a ship either designed or built that would have remained afloat subject to the same conditions as prevailed on the occasion to which I refer. If the "Belleisle" had not been sunk it would have only meant one of two things—either that our guns would have been absolutely useless, or that our gunners would have been worse than useless With regard to the question of fire between decks on board ship, I think it has been much exaggerated. I

was glad to see the result of those experiments, because it was quite what I expected. The danger has been very much overrated. I have never seen a fire between decks on board a ship in my life, and I have only seen six fires below deck, and only two of those were serious. In the case of a fire on board ship the real danger is in regard to the smoke, but there is not sufficient material between decks on board a man-of-war prepared for action to make sufficient smoke to be a source of danger. I am quite certain that, providing there were any of the crew left alive after being subjected to a murderous fire that would probably occur in a naval action, if any fire occurred it could easily be extinguished. There is also the question of wooden decks. The last portion of a ship that burns is her deck. I remember the occasion of a fire on board a transport which had been smouldering for hours before it was discovered. Part of the main decks were charred through, and to walk along it was like going over thin ice; nevertheless, by doing so we were enabled to save the ship, whereas if there had been an iron deck we would not have been able to walk on it on account of the heat, and the vessel would have been lost. It has been proved, even in wooden ships, that the deck is about the last portion of the ship to burn. The only other case of a fire I ever saw was that of the Bombay, and in this case some of the guns on the ship were loaded at the time the fire broke out. Some twenty minutes or half an hour after everybody had been driven out of the ship by the flames and smoke, these guns went off and it was a plain proof from the direction of the shots that the deck of the vessel was intact at the time. That shows, I think, that the deck does not burn so readily as the parts of the ship that are upright. That view was borne out by another fire on board ship where the guns went off after the crew had all left the ship, and a number of men were wounded on a ship which was moored alongside. Therefore I think it is clear that the danger of fire between decks has been very much overrated. The hon. Member for Bolton has referred to the question of submarine boats, but that is a very old story. Submarine boats have been experimented with now for nearly forty years. I remember that some experiments were made with a submarine boat in Valparaiso Harbour. It was a perfect submarine boat, for it went down and has not come up since. No doubt something may be done in this direction, and something may be learned, and I am glad that the Admiralty are turning their attention to this matter.

*SIR U. KAY-SHUTTLEWORTH (Lancashire, Clitheroe): The leader of the Opposition has given expression to the satisfaction felt in all quarters of the House at the promise of a Committee. So that there is no need for me to say more upon that point. There is one phrase used by my right hon. friend with respect to the officials at the Admiralty which I, as an old member of the Admiralty, may be allowed to emphasise. It is that I cordially hope there will be no feelings of regret, or any notion that an aspersion is cast upon anybody, at the Admiralty, by the appointment of this Committee. No doubt the House has read with a good deal of interest the very frank admission which is made in the Memorandum of the defects which have occurred in the ships both in regard to boilers and engines. I think this Committee will meet the undoubted uneasiness which exists in the minds of many people in this country upon this subject, and the Committee is not intended in any sense as a reflection upon the Admiralty at large, and certainly not upon the Engineer-in-chief, Sir John Durston, who has borne such a heavy responsibility and taken such a bold step in advising the Admiralty to adopt water-tube boilers. Perhaps I may be allowed to say that I think there has been a somewhat ungracious response, at all events on the part of one or two Members on the other side of the House, to this announcement of the First Lord of the Admiralty. On this side of the House I think I may claim that his remarks have been received in a more gracious spirit. The hon. Member for the Shipley division and the hon. Member for King's Lynn did not seem to accept graciously the answer of the right hon. gentleman in regard to the Belleville boilers.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: The right hon. Gentleman has no right to say that, for I accepted it most graciously.

*Sir U. KAY-SHUTTLEWORTH: There are some very important and serious matters for this Committee to inquire into, and amongst them I will only refer to two. After all, it does seem to me that it is somewhat a beating of the air and a waste of the valuable time of this House at this stage of the session to enter into any full debate upon the subject of water-tube boilers, for the consideration of which, this Committee has been apppointed. I think hon. Members who came down prepared to deliver speeches on the subject of water-tube boilers may very well put their notes in their pockets, as I intend to do, and leave the subject to be thoroughly threshed out by the Committee. I do hope that great attention will be paid to what the First Lord of the Admiralty very truly called a very important part of the subject—namely, the human element. All the speakers who have spoken with knowledge upon this subject to-day have dealt with the human element. It is a fact which is known to those who have paid close attention to this subject that, in some of the ships in our Navy and in many foreign ships where these very boilers have been used, the difficulties have been overcome, and it does seem to me that if the human element is after all the greatest difficulty in the matter, the most important problem to solve is the training of the human element that has so much to do with these water-tube boilers. The *personnel* of our engine-room and stoke-hole contingents seems to be a very important matter for consideration. There is another point which I will only just mention. First of all let me say that I entirely agree that neither the present Board of Admiralty nor its predecessor is pledged to any particular type of water-tube boilers. It was decided some years ago that water-tube boilers should be applied not only to torpedo destroyers but to big ships, and the only available water-tube boiler was the Belleville boiler. I particularly wish to put in that preface before saying what I am about to say. I remember very well that my hon. friend the Member for Lewisham stated in a speech, a year ago, that the water-tube boiler had come to stay. I think that is the general opinion of persons in this House and outside. So far as the navies of the world, and our own Navy in particular, are concerned, I adopt the phrase of my hon. friend that the water-tube boiler has come to stay. I do not think that anybody with an intelligent acquaintance with the subject, who considers the question without prejudice and without partial affection for the old cylindrical boiler, would have come to any different conclusion. There is no reason on that ground why we should be wedded to the Belleville boiler. But, having adopted this French invention, I think the House will agree with me that we should gather all the light we can from the advances which have been made in France and other countries, and I think we ought also to avail ourselves of all the experience which has been gained by the inventor and his firm. The fact is perhaps known to some Members of this House that a gentleman who occupied not long ago the position of Director of Dockyards, who stands very high among the naval constructors of this country, has lately paid a visit to France upon this subject in order to satisfy himself upon this point, about which he felt great anxiety, and he went to investigate those defects arising from or connected with the boilers and engines in ships fitted with Belleville boilers. The result of those inquiries has been satisfactory. I think we should send representatives over to Paris to have personal interviews with Mr. Belleville and ascertain what has been done in Paris. I understand that Mr. Belleville will be pleased for anyone from the Admiralty or the Navy to be placed in possession of the full knowledge he possesses on the subject. We have for years paid large royalties for the use of this invention. Therefore we have a claim upon Mr. Belleville, who ought to be willing to afford us the fullest information with respect to the way in which these difficulties have been overcome in France, for example as regards the little contrivances which have been adopted for getting over many of the difficulties in connection with the corrosion of the tubes, leakage of joints, and the excessive consumption of coal in Belleville boilers. I venture to suggest that this Committee should visit Paris, and should ascertain from Mr. Belleville himself all the experience he can give upon this subject. As the reputation of his invention is at stake he will be willing to give full information. Passing from the subject of these water-tube boilers, I want to ask just one or

two questions with regard to the additional estimate we have before us. My first question is with respect to the purchase of destroyers. I have very little doubt that, as regards the "Viper's" sister vessel, fitted with the steam turbine, this is a very wise purchase on the part of the Admiralty. But, as regards the rest, I observe that they cost more than £70,000 each, and I should like to have a few particulars about them. I should like to know what is their speed. The First Lord of the Admiralty told us that negotiations were going on at the commencement of the financial year in regard to these destroyers, and I am sure he will be ready to give the House fuller information on the subject. With regard to the repairing ship I should like to know what speed it will have. I do not object to having further repairing ships, and I have not a word of criticism to say against this proposal. I do not propose to detain the House any longer, although I was prepared to say more upon the water-tube boiler question had it not been for the concession of the First Lord of the Admiralty.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER (Belfast, W.): I shall endeavour to act upon the advice of the right hon. Baronet who has just sat down in regard to the discussion of water-tube boilers, although I was prepared to go into the question at length. I think that is only a reasonable course in view of the statement made by the First Lord of the Admiralty this evening. I shall certainly take the advice of the right hon. Baronet, and I am sure he will not find me wanting in recognition of the concession which the First Lord of the Admiralty has made in granting this Committee. The decision which the First Lord has arrived at seems to me to be eminently in the public interest. It is perhaps more acceptable to me because, like many others, I have for two years been urging upon the Admiralty that some inquiry of this kind should be granted in order to set at rest the doubts which have affected some minds in respect to the merits or demerits of the Belleville boiler. I certainly claim for myself that until very recently I have never expressed, because I never felt justified in expressing any very strong opinion against these boilers, but I have always said that there has been an amount of doubt about them which was calculated to make one feel uneasy. Therefore I welcome the appointment of this Committee. I do not share the view which is held by the hon. Member for Gateshead, who seems actually to desire that these boilers should be condemned. That is not my view, for no one would rejoice more than I should if this Committee which is to be appointed should report absolutely in favour of these boilers to which the Navy is so largely committed. The right hon. Gentleman must feel that the doubt which has hitherto existed in regard to this experiment has been enormously increased by the publication of this Report. I have seen these boilers fitted, I have seen them under trial, and I have done my best to acquaint myself with their performances, and this Report does not come altogether as a surprise to me. But it is an official confirmation of what many of us have been feeling—namely, that we are committed to an experiment of so great a magnitude that it is not tolerable that we should continue it any longer in this condition of doubt. There is ample justification for an inquiry in the fact that there are forty millions sterling embarked in sixty-one ships, and much more than forty millions, because there is also the whole safety of the Navy, and behind that the safety of the nation. Now we have an admission — ample, official, undoubted — that the whole of this expenditure is at this moment dependent on a series of experiments. The Admiralty are sanguine as to the ultimate result of these experiments. I am most anxious to share that sanguine view, and I should be rejoiced if it is justified by the result; but I do not think it is possible that the country should be longer asked to subscribe to this expenditure until we are absolutely sure of what we are being committed to. I think I shall not be trespassing on the advice given me by my right hon. friend opposite if I say one word with regard to the work which I hope the Committee about to be appointed may do. Nothing has struck me more in reading this Report than the curiously unscientific character of the experiments which have been made. I hear and see something now and then of scientific work, and of scientific experiments. We know that qualitative and quantitative experiments are now performed with a perfection and accuracy that guarantees almost perfect results. But in experiments no single trial has

been made which would be regarded in a laboratory as worthy of being called a test at all. The ships which have been tried have not been the same in any sense. In these days the advantage is with the newer ship; but in the very first experiment that presumption is reversed, because we are told in the Memorandum that the advantage was with the "Minerva," with her trained crew, as against the "Highflyer," although the two ships were three or four years apart in date. That is not the way to make experiments. We want two ships of the same class, under the same conditions, and with equal crews. I do not think the hon. Member for Gateshead challenged the honesty and good faith of the Admiralty officials, but I think he was justified in pointing out that some forty or fifty tons of water were carried in the tanks of the "Highflyer," whereas that fact is not revealed in the Report before us. That is a very relevant fact indeed, because it so happens that an almost equal number of tons is quoted in another part of the Report as the weight which would enable one of the cylindrical boiler ships to produce the same horse-power if put in the form of machinery. Therefore, the hon. Gentleman was thoroughly justified in calling attention to that fact. Not in one single case in the trials between those two ships can the experiments be called scientific. The "Ocean" has been quoted. The "Ocean" is a recently constructed ship, and presumably has in her machinery every single appliance that the most modern science could supply. She was designed especially for speed, being the fastest of the ironclads produced up to the present time, and the design has been realised. But, as my hon. friend opposite said, speed is not a matter of boilers, but of a variety of causes, and it is slightly misleading, when we are told that the "Ocean" did exactly what she was designed for, because that is not conclusive as regards her boilers. The argument of the First Lord is that these ships are so dissimilar in their results that it is as unfair to judge from one single trial of an unsuccessful ship as it would be to judge from one trial of a successful ship.

MR. GOSCHEN: We cannot have two ships exactly alike, launched and commissioned on the very same days, and exactly of the same dimensions; but we have done our best, and we have taken two ships as similar as we could get, and now we are told that the experiments have been unscientific because we have been unable to realise conditions which no human power could possibly realise. We have done our very best.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Of course, I was not challenging the *bona fides* of the Admiralty, but I think it is permissible when we are asked to take conclusions from a number of trials to criticise those trials and to point out that they could not be regarded as conclusive. I myself ventured to suggest to the chief of the engineering staff of the Admiralty that a trial should be made on an extensive scale, and that two vessels like the "Diadem" and "Edgar" should be sent on a long trooping voyage, where all the chances of the sea might be encountered over a long series of days. I suggested the "Edgar," because she is the finest example that could be got of the cylindrical boiler ship of large dimensions. My proposal was not adopted. The right hon. Gentleman says, and it is perfectly true, that it is very difficult to make these comparisons. All I mean to say is that if that be so we must regard all these conclusions as approximate only, and that an element of uncertainty must enter into every one of them. Then there is another matter in the Report to which I wish to refer. In the concluding paragraph we are told that had it not been for the courage of the Admiralty in introducing the Belleville boiler into the "Powerful" and the "Terrible," when they did, sixty-one ships which are enumerated in the Report as built or to be built would have at least a knot less speed than they now have or will have. That is an illusory statement. Many ships have been built, or are now under construction, both in this country and abroad, which have or will have this superior speed, and yet have not or will not have Belleville boilers. I think it cannot be too well understood that it was not necessary that the Belleville boilers should have been introduced in order to obtain this extra amount of speed. The statement of the right hon. Gentleman, who no doubt dealt broadly with the matter, has, I think, been the cause of a little confusion. As the hon. Member for King's Lynn pointed out, the impression created when the right hon.

Gentleman referred to foreign countries was that they had universally adopted the Belleville boiler. That is not the case. For three years I have been studying this question, and I have taken as public a part as was permitted me in these discussions, and I think I have some knowledge of the facts. The right hon. Gentleman quoted the French Mediterranean Squadron, and spoke about that splendid fleet, but I do not think he made it quite clear to the Committee that of that great fleet nine of the finest vessels had not Belleville boilers. I only desire to remove the impression that the great French Mediterranean Squadron is an example to us of how the Belleville boiler produces extra speed. I ought to add that Germany, with one single exception, has not adopted the Belleville boiler, that the United States has not adopted it at all, and that in the Dutch fleet a very remarkable experiment has been made in some of the ships by adopting a kind of combined water-tube and cylinder boiler. Therefore I think I am justified in saying that if hon. Members were under the impression that the general tendency of foreign countries had been in the direction of adopting the Belleville boiler that impression was formed under a misapprehension. Apart from these remarks I am most delighted to hear that an enquiry is to be held. I have no doubt as to the *bonâ fide* manner in which it will be conducted. Generally speaking this Report has been prepared —I will not say most creditably, because that was to be expected—but in a most satisfactory manner, which is calculated to give us confidence in those who have prepared it. I think we might have some more information given us on some points, but, on the whole, the Memorandum is a worthy and informing document as far as it goes, and I think we may await with great confidence the result of the impartial inquiry which is to be held, and I hope that it will result in establishing the view now held by the Admiralty. I think, with many other hon. Members, that the persistency with which the senior officials of the Admiralty have held to the advantages of the Belleville boiler is a matter which ought to have great weight, and it is a presumption which does require very strong evidence to upset it. I should like to refer to a matter mentioned by the hon. Member for Bolton, because I think it requires more than a passing notice, and that is the question of submarine boats. This is clearly a case which might have been dealt with as a technical matter, and if the First Lord had come down to this House and said that in the opinion of the engineering advisers of the Admiralty the accomplishment of the mechanical problem of making and working a submarine boat was so remote that there was no reasonable probability that such a boat could be created, and that, therefore, we had no reason for action, I should have been very slow to contradict him, because on that matter I am not competent to form an opinion which could be set beside the opinion of the engineers of the Admiralty. But that is not the line taken by the First Lord. He put the question on a footing which enables every Member of this House to form a judgment on it. He said that the Admiralty had not designed a submarine boat, and did not at present propose to design one, because a submarine boat was the weapon of the inferior Power. When he said that he reduced the whole question to a plain issue which plain men can discuss. If a submarine boat is impossible there is nothing more to be said, but if it can be produced as a working article—and that it can be produced I have no doubt whatever—then this argument about the weapon of the inferior Power seems absolutely meaningless. The Power which possesses the submarine boat will no longer be the inferior Power. The Power which possesses a really effective submarine boat, especially in the narrow waters of the Channel, will not be the inferior, but the superior Power, and the mere statement that we consider ourselves to be the superior Power will not affect the position. I was at Spithead the other day and saw one of our great battleships there, and I could not help asking myself what would happen if one of these French plunging boats were to approach that vessel in the dawn of the early morning. I saw absolutely nothing known to man which could save that ironclad in such a case. I am assuming that the probability of submarine navigation has been solved, and that these submarines, or *plongeurs*, can be made. I do not think that is a very great assumption when we see a body like the United States Navy Department, I suppose the most practical navy Department in the world except our own, devoting a large part of their energy and

large sums of money to working out this problem. I say it is not altogether improbable to imagine that a solution will be found, and when once the problem is solved, there will be no protection except that offered by a torpedo-net, and that is a protection which every naval man would be reluctant to adopt; because, if it were adopted, it would absolutely paralyse the ship as an effective force in a naval action. If the danger is so easily guarded against as the right hon. Gentleman seems to think, and if we may rest secure without producing these boats ourselves, well and good, and I am delighted to hear it, but I say that the Power which possesses this engine will cease to be the inferior Power and will become the superior Power. We, beyond all nations, are exposed to the attacks of these boats. Everyone who knows the Channel must realise how absurdly small and narrow it is. It is like a navigable inland lake, and you no sooner leave one side than you are at the the other. There is one classical instance of the use of the submarine boat, and that was during the civil war in the United States. Three times the boat sank with her crew, and three times a fresh crew was got, and ultimately she achieved her task and sank one of the Federal ships. That was at a time when the mechanical appliances in connection with ship construction were as nothing compared with those of the present day, and I submit it is not satisfactory that we should stand by and allow others to carry out this problem without ourself making some attempt to solve it. The right hon. Gentleman referred—as I thought, not very apropos of his argument—to the tendency of the Admiralty to follow not to lead other great nations. I admit that that has been the tendency, and from it I draw a lesson not very comforting in this particular case. It has been mentioned that in ironclad ships we have been behind, and have been compelled to follow, that in the matter of breechloading guns we have been behind, and have been compelled to follow, and that in the matter of armoured cruisers we have been behind, and have been compelled to follow at a terrible disadvantage. The fact is that not once or twice but several times we have been compelled to follow. It may be said, "Oh, but we gained a great advantage in all these cases by not taking the lead." I heard that argument put in a more striking form in the other House. It was admitted that there was a failure to place guns at Singapore for fourteen years; but that failure was regarded as a great triumph of foresight, because it was said that if the guns had been placed there fourteen years ago they would have been obsolete now, and that was claimed as a triumph of foresight. I hope one of these days we may not follow a little too late. Our lesson with regard to the ironclads, the breechloaders, and the armoured cruisers is exactly the same lesson which the Austrian army experienced in 1866 when they were compelled to learn the merits of the breechloader by studying its effects on the field of battle. I think there is room for some misgiving with regard to the attitude taken up with reference to submarine navigation.

*Mr. MATHER (Lancashire, Rossendale): I am glad to be able to say that this Memorandum appears to me to have been conceived in the most transparent desire to state the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth as regards the experience of the Admiralty in connection with the new ships fitted with water-tube boilers. As an engineer with considerable experience of boilers in various parts of the world, I venture to say that a water-tube boiler is theoretically and scientifically correct. For myself I would prefer to see this country leading foreign nations instead of being led; and it is the absolute and patriotic duty of the Government of this country to experiment continually on the discoveries of science and see how far they may be adapted to our use. I do not consider that there is anything in this Memorandum to convince the House or the country that water-tube boilers, even of the Belleville type, have failed, although they have been tried under circumstances not the most favourable for their development. I have only one comment to make from my experience as a practical engineer upon the Admiralty's action, or their methods of trial, in endeavouring to ascertain whether this type of boiler was worthy of their acceptance, or suitable for adaptation to the Navy. I think the experience they required before placing these boilers in sixty of our first-class ships might have been thoroughly attained if they had taken one ship, and fitted it with a water-tube boiler which was intended to be a type of the system. In the ordinary development of scientific engineering it is custo-

mary, when you have faith in a new principle, or in a new adaptation of an old principle, to place upon one trial those conditions which will in a very short space of time compress an amount of strain and stress for which, in the ordinary course, a considerable number of years would be required. I cannot understand why one ship was not supplied with water-tube boilers of the best design and of the best workmanship, and sent for a whole year's cruise all over the world with a first-class staff on board, and accompanied by practical men, for the purpose of learning anything by which the country might have been saved hundreds and thousands of pounds. I find on page 14 of the Memorandum what are called "general observations," in which some excuse is offered to the House for a certain want of competency on the part of the *personnel* of the staffs of these ships, and also a want of a calculation of the peculiarities of these boilers. It would seem that the staff were so much occupied with the imperfect trials of many ships at the same time that they were over-taxed. But surely in order to arrive at the truth which experience can give in the quickest possible way, the rational thing would have been for the Admiralty to have taken one ship and condensed into one year the experience of four or five. Now we are told that we must not expect that all the weaknesses of these boilers would be discovered in four or five years. But the Admiralty ought to have created possible weaknesses in one ship for the purpose of dealing exhaustively with them. In this way they would have discovered innumerable details which appeared in the ships which were subsequently tried, and the tax upon the staff would have been greatly diminished. Scientifically, small water-tubes are much better than larger water-tubes for the purpose of generating steam; and what is scientifically and theoretically right cannot be practically wrong. It used to be said that a thing might be right in theory but wrong in practice. Now we know that what is theoretically right only needs human ingenuity to make it right in practice also. I maintain that this Memorandum does not do justice even to the Admiralty themselves. I am struck with the singular, almost innocent, ingenuousness of the confessions made here. There are many matters mentioned in detail that need not have been brought before this House, because they are the common events that occur in working machinery of every kind. But it appears to me that the whole scheme of machinery and apparatus throughout the ships is eminently a source of very great alarm. I am led to believe, from a study of this Memorandum, that there is something very radically wrong in designing the details of the system of the machinery on board the ships of war, or that the work is let to contractors under conditions that do not admit of that work being executed in the most perfect way possible. I will not call it cheese-paring; but there is some mistaken policy on the part of the Admiralty, or some lack in the discharge of duty. I cannot believe that this complaint would lie at the door of any contractor in this country worthy of being entrusted with the construction of a ship of war. I hope the Committee will not confine itself solely to the question of water-tube boilers. That is a matter which will settle itself in due course. What is more serious than water-tube boilers are the statements made in this Memorandum, leading us to believe that throughout the whole engineering practice of the Admiralty there is something radically wrong in not providing more efficient apparatus to meet the stress and strain of high pressure. The First Lord spoke of a pressure of 200 lbs. or 300 lbs. as something very high; but we are accustomed to that in land work, and provision has to be made that the steam pipes do not leak, and that the valves and other accessories do not give way. All that should be based on principles and practice perfectly well known, and which are, in fact, the commonplaces of engineering science. This Memorandum — drafted, I presume, by the First Lord's official advisers—has been prepared with a candour which is beyond all praise. There never has been a document presented to Parliament more transparently honest, or drawn up with a more sincere desire to be absolutely truthful. I may overestimate the gravity of the words used, but I do feel uneasy on the point, that there are throughout the ships and the apparatus on board them here described, a certain weakness and certain defects running throughout the whole arrangements which demand the most earnest attention of the engineering staff of the Admiralty, and which will call for

the attention of the Committee to be appointed. One of the explanations which the First Lord gave as to the difficulty of maintaining these ships at a constant speed throughout the length of their voyages was the long range of steam pipes passing from the boiler-room right through the ship to auxiliary engines, etc. It was, he said, very difficult to keep these pipes tight on account of the vibration of the ship, especially with steam at a pressure of 300lbs. But is it absolutely beyond the power of the Admiralty to provide another means of transmitting power? Why, we have been passing Bills in this House for transmitting electrical current for power for miles and miles on land; and there is less difficulty in doing so on board ship. The motors and other mechanical appliances for transmitting the electrical power could easily be established in a central station near the chief engines and boilers, and all steam pipes avoided. If I understand the right hon. Gentleman aright, I am very distrustful of the attention paid by the engineering staff to what is called the subordinate positions. There is no country in the world containing a greater amount of genius in the chief constructors and the higher engineering staff than our own, but we have not got the great army of young men coming out of the schools able to take up the control of scientific details in subordinate positions. As "all roads lead to Rome," so if once we provided good scientific education, the Government would be provided with a large number of highly trained young men who would be forthcoming to take charge of every detail in our ships. We must remember that it is not the large but the small things in these ships which make for success. It is the greatness of the little. It is the want of vigilance in the smallest detail out of sight of the chief engineer and the captain which leads to disaster. I do hope the First Lord will take these matters into consideration. We want our Navy to be stronger year after year. We want it to be the chief defence of our country and the Empire, and we do not care what money is spent upon it. But we want the best equipment and the services of scientifically trained young men, ready to face every scientific development, including water-tube boilers. Under such circumstances we need not fear that our Navy will be unworthy of the country of which we are all so proud.

Mr. Mather.

Mr. JOHN PENN (Lewisham): As one who asked for the appointment of a Committee to investigate the subject of water-tube boilers, I seize this opportunity of thanking the Admiralty for taking a step which I believe will be of very great advantage to the public service. There is, however, one point I want to make. I understand that this Committee will deal only with the question of water-tube boilers. I would venture to ask, if I may not be considered a bore, that the reference should be extended so as to include the engine-room complement within the scope of the inquiry. And for this reason, that whatever form of water-tube boiler is to be adopted in the service, it is fairly obvious that the water-tube boiler will take a larger amount of attention than the old cylindrical boiler, because of the larger number of mechanical accessories. That should be borne in mind by the Committee in making their investigation. The right hon. Baronet the late Secretary to the Admiralty raised a point as to the Belleville Company being located in France; and he was anxious that there should be larger conferences with the authorities in France. I want to be independent of the Belleville Company. I am not one of those who think that we are dependent on ideas in Paris. Besides, this running over to Paris for ideas might come under the doctrine of contraband of war. I have more faith than the Admiralty in the engineering talent of our own country. In these debates we hear of the extraordinary performances of the ships of the mercantile marine. It is quite true that some of these ships can keep up a speed of 20 knots an hour, but I would like them to be handed over to the engineers in our dockyards and run at full power. I doubt whether a very large margin over 20 knots would then be found. I again thank the Admiralty for granting this Committee.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): This discussion has raised a subject of great importance, and I am not going to add one unnecessary word to what has been said about the Belleville boilers. It devolved on me to bear the first brunt of the attack on these boilers five years ago from the hon. Member for Gateshead. I should like to associate myself with what has been said as to the course taken by the Admiralty. I thoroughly approve

and welcome the concessions made by the First Lord. I entirely believe in the candour of the Memorandum laid on the Table, and I thank him for having admirably fulfilled the suggestions I made to him three weeks ago. I think the discussions on the Belleville boiler may well cease after the announcement made by the First Lord, and I hope that the inquiry will be useful. I understand that something has been said on another technical point on which the First Lord has not made any announcement—that is in regard to submarine boats in other navies. I daresay the First Lord will tell us what is the deliberate view of the Admiralty on that subject after a consideration of five years. In the time of the old Board I do not think it was very possible to get a hearing on the matter; but the question has developed enormously since both in France and America. I think the House and the country have a right to know what the First Lord, advised as he is by the best expert evidence, thinks is the true policy to be pursued by this country. One other word of entirely general interest. Not a single remark has been made to-night so far as I know about the alarming growth of this Vote. This is the master Vote of the Navy Estimates; it controls all other Votes; and if it is increased all the other Votes must necessarily be increased, and yet not one word has been said on either side of the House about the tremendous prospect opened out to us. Let me read one or two figures. Eleven years ago the Shipbuilding Vote stood at £4,300,000 in a total Navy Estimate of £13,000,000—or in a normal year when there was no particular fluctuation, a proportion of four to thirteen. In 1894-5 the Shipbuilding Vote had increased to £7,300,000—or nearly double out of a total Navy Estimate of £18,400,000. Where are we now? I am taking no account of the additional Estimates which the First Lord will lay on the Table by and by; but this year the Shipbuilding Vote is £13,100,000, very near the total Navy Estimate of 1888-9; and the total Navy Estimate this year has reached the alarming figure of £28,500,000, although that is not by any means so large as it must become through the natural consequences of the Shipbuilding Vote. If we had the same numerical proportion as we had in normal times, we should have in ten years, even if not a penny were added to the Shipbuilding Vote, a total Navy Estimate of £40,000,000. No one can, at the present moment, gain any sort of popularity by calling attention to this enormous expenditure; indeed he may possibly suffer personal damage in doing so. But surely those responsible, however strongly they may believe in the necessity of a powerful Navy, should have the courage to point out to the people the enormity of the expenditure now reached, and the prospect of a still greater expenditure to be reached in future. There is only one other point I desire to refer to, and that is that the benefit of the thirty millions sterling we are now spending on the Navy accrues as much to our self-governing colonies as it does to Ireland or Scotland. Ireland and Scotland stand to the United Kingdom numerically in about the same proportion as Australia and Canada, and yet Australia and Canada do not contribute one farthing towards the Imperial naval expenditure. The only people who have proposed to pay a scintilla of its great obligation towards naval expenditure is the despised minority of Cape Colony. I venture to say that at the present moment, having regard to the state of our colonies and their feelings towards us, it would not be inopportune to suggest to them that they are rich, richer than many of those who have to contribute towards the naval expenditure in this country, and that they should contribute. Why should Australia have a free Navy provided for it at the expense of the poorest washerwoman in Ireland or Scotland? For every million we are voting to-night another quarter of a million will be required, and it is only right that our colonies should contribute to our naval expenditure.

*MR. DAVID MACIVER (Liverpool, Kirkdale) said he did not propose to follow the hon. Gentleman who had just addressed the House, but to come back to the question of the water-tube boilers. As a shipowner of some experience he might say that water-tube boilers had both advantages and disadvantages, and if we were wrong using them in our Navy other countries who had followed our lead in this matter were also wrong, so that there need be no

alarm in the matter. In this regard he was, however, bound to except two countries. The United States of America had not blindly followed our lead in this matter, and our German friends did not rely upon the water-tube boilers altogether, and in their later and newer vessels were placing boilers of both kinds. The right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Admiralty had rather disarmed criticism by suggesting the appointment of a Committee to inquire into the matter, and although he (Mr. MacIver) felt a great deal of sympathy with him, he was not much in favour of this Committee. He did not think this Committee would discover anything further than would be ascertained by spending a few days at Newhaven or Dieppe. He thought we should endeavour to obtain information as to the merits and the demerits of the Belleville boilers wherever we could. The Great Western Railway, with which he was connected, possessed several steamers, and a short time previously he inquired of the marine superintendent as to the working of these boilers. That gentleman had previously been in the service of the London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway, whose steamers, with those of the Chemin de Fer de l'Ouest, worked the service with Dieppe, and informed him that the Belleville boilers ran for about a fortnight and then that the French steamers so fitted were laid up for some six or seven weeks, whilst the other form of boilers gave no trouble whatever. The Belleville boilers had had a most exhaustive trial in the British mercantile marine, and had been discarded. They were a constant source of trouble, and did not appear to have the advantages that were claimed for them, and, except in the case of one shipping company, there was no one of any importance connected with the mercantile marine who had persevered with water-tube boilers of any kind. Those who were engaged in the shipping trade were not all fools, but men who understood their business, and had these boilers possessed any of the advantages which were claimed for them they would be found in the mercantile marine; but, except in the steamers of his hon. friend the Member for Hull, there was hardly a water-tube boiler of any kind in any trading steamship in the country. He wished to qualify his remarks by saying that, although he did not believe in the Belleville boilers in the slightest, he did thoroughly believe in the First Lord of the Admiralty, who had given his best attention to the subject. If there was anything wrong in the matter the right hon. Gentleman was not to blame, but the professional advice with which he had been assisted, and this was also true as regarded the Secretary to the Admiralty and the Junior Lord. One fact was beyond dispute; in many points the Navy did not, as regards much of its everyday work, differ materially from the mercantile marine, and if in the experience of the mercantile marine these boilers had proved to be what they were said to be, they would not have been discarded as they had been. But in the mercantile service they had proved to be of no use at all. He had not the slightest doubt that for many purposes water-tube boilers were the right thing —for destroyers and for small vessels, for instance, but when it came to vessels of considerable size into which forty-eight boilers had to be put, then there were 48,000 different things to look after, which it was almost impossible for human skill to successfully do. He had no doubt that the Committee offered by the right hon. Gentleman would be a useful one, but the constitution of it would be a difficult matter. They ought not to put gentlemen upon it who looked forward to obtaining work from the Admiralty. There were gentlemen in the House representing constituencies where shipbuilding for the Government was being carried on, and these also should be excluded. Had he represented Birkenhead he might not have spoken so freely, because his former constituents worked for the Admiralty; but now he had no such ties. There were other shipowners in the House who could speak as he had done in this matter, and he hoped that great care would be taken in the constitution of the Committee.

MR. GOSCHEN: I quite admit that the constitution of the Committee will be a very difficult matter, but I trust that I may be able to satisfy the public. At the same time I would like to give one warning to the House. Almost everyone who has spoken, while accepting the Committee and expressing satisfaction at its appointment, seemed to wish to expand the inquiry further and further into the

whole arrangements of the Admiralty. What I want to see myself is a practical Committee which can practically deal with the questions before them, and which would not be tempted by the consideration of any side issue to delay dealing with the subject upon which the public most desires their decision. It is for that reason that I wish to have practical men and men able to see those boilers at work. There is one point upon which I did not lay sufficient emphasis, and that is the question of the Niclausse *versus* the Belleville boiler which has been raised. Upon that I wish to say that the Admiralty are not wedded to the Belleville boiler, but, as a matter of fact, we are going to introduce the Niclausse boiler in some ships. I am only dealing with the contention that the water-tube system is in itself wrong. It is true—and this I wish the Committee to understand—that though the Niclausse boiler differs from the Belleville in important technical particulars, it does not differ from it in the general principle. The Niclausse boiler is almost the same as the Belleville boiler, except that when required you can take out the whole of the tubes, which you cannot do in the Belleville boiler. It is in these small technical improvements that it is so much better than the Belleville boiler. I am afraid that I cannot gratify the natural curiosity that is felt in regard to that matter. The hon. Member said that we ought to make experiments, and at the same time he pointed out the enormous importance of submarine boats. If we are to make experiments we are not going to disclose the results, which we believe might redound more to the advantage of our competitors than ourselves. If we are to induce shipbuilders to put their mind into the building of submarine boats, we must not make known what has been done to nations which might have the greatest use for these boats. I do not propose publicly to declare whether the Admiralty believe in submarine boats or not. I must ask the House to excuse me. Of course we do not wish to encourage or discourage other nations by stating, as hon. Members wish us to state, how great would be the danger of these submarine boats to ourselves. The House will allow me to be extremely reticent on the subject. My hon. friend said these boats would be easily able to threaten battleships in our dockyards on this side of the Channel. I must add one observation—that we do not neglect submarine boats. We know all about them. We take care that we inform ourselves of every experiment, and endeavour to ascertain the details of every boat introduced; and if we do not make the experiments ourselves, the experiments of other countries are useful to us. The right hon. Gentleman also asked me with regard to the destroyers which we purchased. They are not more expensive than those we have built. I need only say that the cost is about £50,000, the same as we pay for other destroyers, and that they are of the best and newest class of thirty knots. I think the House will feel that this debate has extended long enough.

*MR. JOSEPH WALTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Barnsley): I do not desire to prolong the discussion of the subject now before the House, but I wish to ask for information on two points. I believe that on both sides of the House there is a genuine desire in regard to water-tube boilers that the whole question should be investigated and their efficiency or otherwise clearly demonstrated. I would ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether it is true that the Committee, the appointment of which we have all welcomed, will have power to require that ships in Her Majesty's Navy of every class shall promptly be subjected to practical tests for a sufficient period to demonstrate whether or not the Belleville boilers with which they are fitted are efficient or otherwise. In the next place I would draw the attention of the First Lord of the Admiralty to the declaration made in this House by Her Majesty's Government, that they would place gunboats on the inland waterways of China to protect the lives and property of British traders. When I visited the Upper Yang-tsze a short time ago I found the two gunboats sent to patrol that part were deficient both as regards steaming power and construction for the purpose for which they were intended. I am desired to draw the attention of the First Lord of the Admiralty to this important question in view of the grave situation in China to-day, when the lives

and property of British subjects are seriously endangered not only on the Upper Yang-tsze, but throughout every quarter of China. The two gunboats sent to patrol the Upper Yang-tsze are only able to steam eleven knots, and they have twin screws instead of paddle wheels.

MR. GOSCHEN: What does the hon. Member mean by "patrol the Upper Yang-tsze"?

*MR. JOSEPH WALTON: To patrol the Yang-tsze from Ichang upwards.

MR. GOSCHEN: These boats were never constructed for that purpose.

*MR. JOSEPH WALTON: The pledge given by the Government was to put boats on the inland waterways for the purpose of protecting British trade.

MR. GOSCHEN: I will explain to the hon. Member. These vessels were not built for the purpose. They were built for the general purpose of river service in China; but when it was decided that the gorges should be ascended, these two gunboats were given the task, notwithstanding that they were not specially built for it. At some risk, they undertook to ascend the gorges, and they succeeded in going up.

*MR. JOSEPH WALTON: I will ask the First Lord of the Admiralty, in view of the pledge given by the Government, that British gunboats should be placed on the inland waterways of China for the protection of British trade, and in view of his declaration that the "Woodcock" and the "Woodlark" are unsuitable for patrolling the upper part of the Yang-tsze, whether he has included in the Estimates the sum required for building suitable gunboats in point of steaming power and construction for that service, especially in view of the serious danger to the lives of British subjects in that quarter. There is at present one steamer at Chungking, and I hope that in view of the present emergency the First Lord of the Admiralty may be able to say that he is favourably considering the offer made to him of that boat, and so secure that there shall be one steamer on the Upper Yang-tsze able to afford some protection for the lives and property of British subjects.

MR. GOSCHEN: Yes, there have been some negotiations for the purchase of that steamer.

Question put and agreed to.

2. £4,139,100, for Shipbuilding, Repairs, Maintenance, etc.—Materiel.

3. £2,523,000, for Shipbuilding, Repairs, Maintenance, etc.—Personnel.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport) said he did not know whether at that hour (12.25) the First Lord of the Admiralty considered the opportunity favourable for a long discussion on this most important Vote. In the past they had been afforded full and ample opportunity of discussing it in all its bearings. He suggested that the First Lord of the Admiralty should, as on two previous occasions, give hon. Members an opportunity of going to him and placing before him their views on the various points with which they wished to deal. If he agreed to that it would not be necessary to continue the discussion now.

MR. GOSCHEN agreed to the suggestion, remarking that it would be very useful to him to know the views of hon. Members.

Vote agreed to.

4. £793,200 (Additional) Navy (Supplementary).

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said there was one question which he wished to ask about this Vote. He did not know whether the question was in order or not. He did not know whether this Vote included payments for lyddite. There was an answer given to him that day by the representative of the War Office in reference to the naval lyddite shells. He desired to ask whether the Admiralty had satisfied themselves as to the power of making picric acid for the manufacture of lyddite in this country in time of war. Although he had framed a question upon

this subject he had been unable to get the information he desired. There appeared in the accounts a sum of £16,000 for lyddite shells in times of peace. Up to very recently picric acid was not made in this country at all. The answer he obtained was that it was possible to store it against time of war, but as he understood picric acid would not keep for any length of time, and that being so it was of urgent importance that there should be plant and machinery in this country adequate to the strain to which we should be put in time of war. Another point upon which he desired information, and which was of the first importance, was as to the reserve of guns. In the early portion of the session, the right hon. Gentleman discussed the position of the reserve of naval guns, and he knew that where four guns were made for a ship in the past, there are now five—that was to say, that one extra gun was made for every ship. That was not a true reserve. It was absolutely necessary for us to have a greater reserve of guns than any other Power, as, owing to the use of cordite, there was a very much greater erosion than before. He doubted whether the amount in this Vote for a reserve of guns was sufficient, as he could not but think that in the face of the greater erosion of guns that reserve ought to be very much increased. Full charges were never fired from the guns in times of peace, and even then the erosion was great, but in times of war, when full charges were used, the life of a naval gun was very short.

ADMIRAL FIELD did not wish to prolong the debate, and therefore proposed that Report might be taken to-morrow, when discussion could be allowed.

*SIR J. COLOMB noticed that the reserve for cordite was £28,000. He desired to know whether that was the full estimate for the total amount necessary for the reserve at different stages. He was delighted to find that the Admiralty had become alive to the necessity of considering the reserve of warlike stores.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. MACARTNEY, Antrim, N.) said that throughout the whole discussion which had taken place no doubt had been thrown upon the capacity of the Government to deal with these matters. In answer to the hon. Member for Great Yarmouth, he might say that the Government thought it necessary to provide a reserve of warlike stores adequate to their needs. The £709,000 was a balance.

*SIR J. COLOMB: This £709,000 is part of the total Estimate that is required.

MR. MACARTNEY: Yes.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE complained that the Estimate did not show the proportion of guns in reserve. His point was that the reserve of twelve-inch guns was deficient.

MR. GOSCHEN said that, as a matter of fact, guns were made for new ships before they were able to receive them, and that in itself constituted a very good reserve. As to the twelve-inch guns, all the guns had been carefully gone through as to their calibre.

ADMIRAL FIELD said, as his suggestion had not been taken before the Vote went through, he desired to have some information as to the cordite explosion on board the "Revenge," and also some information as to the supply of armour-piercing projectiles and shells, which he was informed was very short. He also understood that while the French had a shell which would pierce our armour, we had not one which would pierce theirs.

Vote agreed to.

5. £267,100, Admiralty Office.

*SIR J. COLOMB pointed out that it was now half-past twelve o'clock, and that was the hour at which it was proposed to discuss this Vote, which was the only one upon which general questions as to the training of officers, etc., could be raised. He did not want to trouble the House at so late an hour, but at the same time there were several points upon which he desired information,

and therefore he should like to know whether the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury was prepared to take the Report stage at a more reasonable time.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I am most anxious to meet my hon. friend, but, looking at the position in which I am placed, I do not think it would be possible to do as he suggests, and I should only be doing him an injustice if I made the promise he asks for.

*SIR J. COLOMB supposed that under those circumstances he would have to make his observations as short as possible, and confine them to one point. It would be in the recollection of the Committee that he had put a question as to the amount of sea service which was done by officers in training in the Channel and Mediterranean Squadrons, and he asked that question because he believed that the sea service was far too short. There was too much training on shore, and too little training at sea. He had asked a question as to the amount of time spent at sea and on shore by Admirals from the time of their being appointed lieutenants, and his right hon. friend replied that it was not possible to give an account of an Admiral's training in that way. The present Commander-in-Chief of the Mediterranean Fleet had only six or seven years service afloat in thirty years. He would shut up the discussion at once if his right hon. friend would promise a Return showing the sea and shore services of the different Admirals whose flags were flying, and the amount of time they had spent at sea since promotion to lieutenants. This question was agitating the service very much. It was a burning question in every service club, and on board of every ship. He hoped the First Lord would give him the information he asked on simple matters of fact.

ADMIRAL FIELD said the First Sea Lord had been turned out of his house because the Chancellor of the Exchequer was unwilling to give the extra rent demanded by the ground landlord. It was most important that the residence should be near the Admiralty, because telegrams sometimes arrived during the night which required prompt attention.

THE EARL OF DALKEITH (Roxburghshire) said he sincerely hoped that his right hon. friend would take this matter into serious consideration, so that in future the First Sea Lord might be provided with a house near his work, where he could attend to the important questions which required to be dealt with in all parts of the world without delay.

MR. GOSCHEN said, in reply to the question raised by the hon. Member for Great Yarmouth, that the present commanders were not one whit less able to manage their ships than their predecessors. The dashing young officers who took command of the torpedo boat destroyers were doing excellent work, and training themselves for the duties they would have to perform. In view of the number of ships in commission and the few disasters due to any want of seamanship in the Navy, he did not think it was proved that there was any falling off in our naval officers. There might be less good sail-work, but in regard to the qualities of seamanship he thought the records proved that there was no falling off in the capacity of the officers. He promised to look into the Return asked for by the hon. and gallant Member.

Vote agreed to.

Resolutions to be reported To-morrow; Committee to sit again To-morrow.

In pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th day of this instant July, Mr. Speaker adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at ten minutes before One of the clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 18th July, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

WELLINGBOROUGH AND DISTRICT TRAMROADS BILL.

Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

GWYRFAI RURAL DISTRICT COUNCIL WATER BILL [Lords].

By Order (Queen's consent signified); read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

BURY AND DISTRICT WATER (TRANSFER) BILL [Lords].

As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

BUENOS AYRES AND ROSARIO RAILWAY BILL [Lords].

COSTA RICA RAILWAY COMPANY, LIMITED, BILL [Lords].

ROE'S PATENT BILL [Lords].

Read a second time, and committed.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 7) BILL [Lords].

Read the third time, and passed, without amendment.

EDUCATION BOARD PROVISIONAL ORDER CONFIRMATION (LONDON) BILL [Lords].

Ordered, That in the case of the Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill [Lords], Standing Order 126 be suspended, and that the Committee have leave to proceed with the Bill To-morrow.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

WALSALL CORPORATION BILL [Lords].

NORTH EASTERN RAILWAY (STEAM VESSELS) BILL [Lords].

Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

LONDON, WALTHAMSTOW, AND EPPING FOREST RAILWAY (ABANDONMENT) BILL.

Reported, without amendment; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

NORTH EASTERN RAILWAY BILL [Lords].

Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

RAILWAY BILLS (GROUP 8).

Sir LEWIS M'IVER reported from the Committee on Group 8 of Railway Bills, That Mr. Nicholson, one of the Members of the said Committee, was not present during the sitting of the Committee this day.

Report to lie upon the Table.

GLASGOW DISTRICT TRAMWAYS BILL [Lords].

Ordered, That the Minutes of Evidence taken before the Committee on the Glasgow District Tramways Bill [Lords], of the present session, be referred to the Committee on Group 8 of Railway Bills. —(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Oban, against; to lie upon the Table.

PUBLIC LIBRARIES BILL.

Petition from Battersea, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

Petition from Saltney, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (No. 2) BILL.

Petition from Chester, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

SUNDAY CLOSING (MONMOUTHSHIRE) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Chester; and Saltney; to lie upon the Table

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT, 1897 (ARMY AND NAVY SERVICE) (MEN EMPLOYED).

Return [presented 16th July] to be printed. [No. 282.]

QUEEN'S COLLEGE (CORK).

Copy presented, of Report of the President for the Session 1899-1900, with Appendices [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL TAXATION (IRELAND) RETURNS.

Copy presented, of Returns for a portion of the year 1898-9 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

METROPOLITAN WATER SUPPLY (ROYAL COMMISSION).

Copy presented, of Maps, Plans, and Diagrams to accompany the Minutes of Evidence and Report of Her Majesty's Commissioners appointed to inquire into the subject of the water supply within the limits of the Metropolitan Water Companies [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRAMWAYS ORDERS CONFIRMATION (No. 3) BILL.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 17th July; *Mr. Ritchie*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 283.]

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 2474 to 2478 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (MISCELLANEOUS SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Miscellaneous Series, No. 534 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

EAST INDIA REVENUE ACCOUNTS.

Ordered, That the several Accounts and Papers which have been presented to the House in this Session of Parliament relating to the Revenues of India be referred to the consideration of a Committee of the whole House.

Resolved, That this House will, upon Thursday the 26th day of this instant July, resolve itself into the said Committee.—(*Secretary Lord George Hamilton.*)

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Mr. HALSEY reported from the Committee of Selection, That they had discharged the following Members from the Standing Committee on Law and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure, at the conclusion of the Elementary Education Bill:—Mr. Loder, Viscount Cranborne, and Colonel Milward; and had appointed in substitution: Mr. H. S. Foster, Mr. Yerburgh, and Mr. Flower.

Mr. HALSEY further reported from the Committee of Selection, That they had discharged the following Member from the Standing Committee on Law and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure:—The Lord Advocate, and had appointed in substitution: Mr. T. W. Russell.

Reports to lie upon the Table.

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP ACT (1878) AMENDMENT (No. 2) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

VOLUNTEERS BILL [Lords].

[SECOND READING.]

Order for Second Reading read.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): This Bill has been framed to advance two objects of importance and a third object which, though undoubtedly of importance, is, as I hope to be able to prove to the House, rather a matter of method and of the convenience, efficiency, and economy which will be derived from it. I cannot better explain the nature of the first object of the Bill or submit the arguments in its favour better than by referring to the Report of the Select Committee which sat on the Volunteer Acts in 1894, for, in the first place, we propose to act upon the recommendations, unanimously arrived at, of that Committee. It was a strong Committee, the chairman being the hon. Member for Hanley, at that time the Financial Secretary of the War Office in the late Government, and it included many Members of the House who are, I think, well entitled to be regarded as authorities in matters affecting the Auxiliary forces, such as the hon. and gallant Members for Lewes, Bath, Sheffield, Lichfield, Islington, and Leith District. This is how they described what is the first object of our Bill. They first recite the present liability to actual military service as it stands in the Volunteer Act Section 17 of the Volunteer Act of 1863 provides that in cases of actual or apprehended invasion in any part of the United Kingdom, the occasion being communicated to both Houses of Parliament if Parliament is sitting, or declared in Council and notified by proclamation if Parliament is not sitting, "Her Majesty may call out the Volunteer corps of the respective counties or of any of them for active

military service." Upon that the Committee found, in the following words—

"There was practical unanimity expressed that the national security might be seriously imperilled under conceivable circumstances falling short of actual or apprehended invasion."

The Committee then went on to say—

"Your Committee is of opinion that the language employed in the Reserve Forces Act of 1882, Section 12, and in the Militia Act of the same year, under which the Army Reserve men are liable to be called out for service and the Militia to be embodied in case of imminent national danger or grave emergency, might be most fittingly adopted."

Those are the words which we propose to substitute in the Volunteer Act for the words which call for a declaration of apprehended invasion. Not only was the Report of the Committee unanimous, but in the next year—1895—several members of the Committee in the course of debate expressed great regret that the Government of the day had not adopted their recommendations; and the hon. Member for Hanley who had presided over the Committee, and who was at the time a Member of the Government, while defending the proposals which the Government did bring in, used these words—

"He hoped that none of the recommendations of the Committee would be lost sight of, and he joined with those who regarded this Bill merely as an instalment."

So that this proposal to substitute the words I have recited for those in the Act, were unanimously recommended six years ago; and a year later the chairman of the Committee, a member of the Government and responsible for the War Office, declared that what they did then must be considered merely as an instalment. Therefore it cannot be said that this is a new plot to revolutionise the character of the Volunteer force. It is, in my opinion, and in the opinion of others who have studied the force, rather a somewhat belated step which is necessary if the Volunteer forces are to be put in a position to discharge the primary functions which they exist to perform. It cannot be said that the circumstances which were conceivable six years ago have not been more fully present to our minds in the early months of this year than in any recent period of our history. I do not base myself on this Report alone, although its weight and authority can hardly be disputed, but I rest myself also upon the experience of the last year, and I may almost say of the last two years. I submit that no Government, during a period of emergency when, perhaps, the Ambassador accredited to this Court from a foreign country was in daily conference with the Foreign Minister in this country—no Government at such a period would declare by Royal proclamation that they had apprehension of an invasion, because such a declaration would paralyse diplomacy and precipitate the very thing they wished to avoid. But if that is so, what is the necessary consequence? It is that you cannot mobilise your Volunteers until an invasion takes place. If the Government cannot and will not issue the proclamation which is necessary because of diplomatic considerations, then when it is issued you will have to mobilise your Volunteers in camp to perform all those operations which have been found more difficult than ever before. You will have to turn them into an effective field army in forty-eight hours. It cannot be done. It is not fair either to the Government, or to the Volunteers themselves, who have shown so much capacity, to ask them to take the field against invasion without some two or three weeks of necessary preparation. Again, we have not dashed into this. It is not an attempt to legislate hurriedly at the end of the session. A conference was called in April last of many representative officers of the Volunteer corps, and not merely of those who represent the London Volunteers. There were four repsesentatives of the North-Eastern district, three of the North-Western, one of the Eastern, one of the Western, one of the South-Eastern, three of Scotland, and only three from London. These sixteen commanding officers of Volunteers were unanimously of opinion that this change ought forthwith to be made. There are other Members of this House, such as the hon. and gallant Member for Kilmarnock, who concur, and it is, indeed, the unanimous recommendation of the Volunteer commanding officers in this country. There have been only two objections, so far as I have heard; one is so frivolous that perhaps I ought not to trouble the House with it. It is said that this Committee did not recommend legislation, but if one turns to the Report it will be seen that that remark is applicable to only one subject—the calling out of the Volunteers to aid the civil power. It is evident that for the rest legislation was recommended. Another objection has been that, if this Bill passes, it will be possible

for the Government to call out the Volunteers without being under the obligation of summoning Parliament within ten days. But that has always been true of our Volunteer Act, although this House somewhat jealously restricted the powers of the Executive in matters of defence, actuated by memories of dangers which are long past—dangers harboured in the minds of the Whigs—lest the Crown should use the Army to oppress the people—dangers harboured in the minds of the Tories—lest it should be used to entangle the country in Continental combinations. But those dangers, which were real at one time, were killed and buried by our ancestors nearly 200 years ago. If anyone wishes to perform ceremonial rights over their graves, I have no objection to move the necessary Amendment; but I consider it to be perfectly idle. But, with or without that, let us have a measure which will meet the dangers that do actually exist in our own day, and not those of a previous generation. Then I come to the second object of the Bill, and in order to explain it I cannot do better than quote another passage from the Report of the Committee which sat six years ago. They say—

"It may be expedient that the garrisons of certain exposed forts, to be manned by Volunteer artillery and corps enrolled for submarine and other coast defence, should be called out at a much earlier stage than the language of the Act would seem to authorise. It has also been suggested that the Secretary of State should be empowered to call out portions of corps, and accept the services of Volunteers proffered under circumstances falling short of the great emergency contemplated; and your Committee concur in thinking such an amendment of the law desirable."

A great deal has happened since 1894. There has been a development in the construction of torpedo-boats among all the navies of the world. This House has authorised the expenditure of large sums of money upon forts, search-lights, and submarine mines to protect the waterways which led up to our commercial harbours. It may not be within the knowledge of all present that we look to the Volunteer Garrison Artillery of this country, in many cases wholly, and in all cases mainly, for the protection of our commercial ports. The Humber, the Tees, Sunderland, the Tyne, the Bristol Channel, the Firth of Forth, the Tay, Aberdeen, and the Clyde are protected against any sudden raid by the Volunteer Garrison Artillery, who are told off to occupy the forts and man the guns, and to look after the submarine mines for which this country has voted so much money of recent years. The garrisons of these forts require 7,500 men out of the 35,000 garrison artillerymen in this country, and I do submit that all that money will be wasted and all the patriotism and devotion to duty of these men will be wasted too, unless the House sees fit to give this enabling power for which the Government now ask. It may be that, at first sight, some exception may be taken to the methods which we have pursued. This enabling power, which would allow us to slip the garrisons into the forts without making appeals to patriotism, and without having meetings called by mayors and lord lieutenants, and without behaving in a way which would be considered insane in any other country in a period of tension is given by Section 2A of this Bill—

"It shall be lawful for Her Majesty to accept the offer of any member of a Volunteer corps to subject himself to one or both of the following liabilities:—(*a*) To be called out for military service at any time," etc.

It may be that in order to effect our object we have taken too wide powers, but why are the words so wide? It is because the Volunteer Act—the law of the land as it now exists—prescribes, and even circumscribes, the occasion on which a Volunteer can be used so closely that without this enabling power it is impossible to use a Volunteer until after the issue of a Royal Proclamation. Even if the Act is amended by Section 1, it will still be necessary to give to the Government of the day an enabling power which will permit of putting the garrisons into these forts. I have laid before the House a Paper which indicates the kind of regulations which might be useful for the Volunteers under the Volunteer Act as amended by this Bill; and as regards the corps to garrison forts, it is laid down that—

"A member of a Volunteer corps may contract to come out for active military service at specified places in Great Britain whenever summoned by order of the Secretary of State for War, to serve for a period not exceeding one month, in the absence of a Royal proclamation calling out the Volunteers generally."

That is all that is intended under Section 2A of this Bill We must have such an enabling power to take that step which is requisite for national defence. It is clear that no pressure will be needed to get 7,500 men out of 35,000 to man these forts and guns. I visited one of these

forts during Whitsuntide, and I can assure the House that they do get full value for their money in respect of the Volunteer Garrison Artillery. The sixteen commanding officers of Volunteers with whom I conferred were unanimous in wishing that this proposal should also be made law forthwith. I do not think that in introducing the Bill I need say more at this stage on those two objects of the Bill. I shall be ready in Committee to meet in detail any objections which may be urged, though I find it difficult to imagine what objections could be urged against these proposals recommended six years ago by a Committee, recommended unanimously by every Volunteer commanding officer whom we have consulted, and also, I think, recommended by recent experience. I come now to the third object of this Bill, which I have described as being rather a matter of method and of convenience. The employment of Volunteers upon active service is not a new question. The Volunteers begged that a certain number should be allowed to take part in active service in 1878; they put forward the same request in 1885; and letter after letter has reached me from Volunteers during the last year complaining—and I quote the language of one letter—that they have been snubbed by the military authorities. The same requests were put forward last June, when some people—though not many—thought that we might be plunged into war, as we were eventually. Again the Volunteers complained that they were snubbed by the military authorities because we were not prepared to accept the offers that were made. The press of the country rang with criticisms against the War Office because it did not at once accept those offers. In January it was impossible to refuse these offers, not because the Regular forces and the Militia could not have dealt adequately with the situation in South Africa, but when you are employing Regulars, Militia, Yeomanry, and Volunteers from Canada, South Africa, and Australia, it was felt that you would be putting a stigma on the Volunteers of this country which would affect the future of the corps if you did not allow them to co-operate with the other forces throughout the Empire. Is it, or is it not, a legitimate aspiration on the part of the Volunteers that those among them who wish to perfect themselves by seeing active service when the whole Empire takes part in fending off some Imperial danger should, if they wish, take a share in the work? Whether that aspiration is legitimate or not has become an academic question. I am convinced that the only practical question which presents itself to us as businesslike men is whether, that being so, the experiment should be repeated under the deplorable conditions which obtained last year. Last year we had to apply tests when every official of the War Office and every officer in the military districts were overworked. The Volunteers had to shoot ankle deep in slush, or to lie down in snow in the fading light of a winter afternoon; and it is ridiculous to assent to a proposition that such offers are to be accepted, and yet we are not to make businesslike preparation for testing in time of peace the men who are willing to come forward in time of emergency. I know it has been said that possibly when this Bill is passed pressure will be put on the Volunteers. Pressure will be avoided. It is when the time of Imperial danger comes, when the press is ringing with patriotic sentiment, when meetings are held all over the country, that pressure is put. It is then, when the authorities might be disposed to accept such offers, that many men are of two minds as to whether they are bound to volunteer or not. How different would it be if in times of peace and quiet those men who have two or three years of their lives to devote to such preparation, who are unmarried, and have no great responsibilities, could register their names and submit themselves to the necessary tests and enter into a contract under such conditions as are agreeable to them, and who will be at your call in the event of a period of Imperial danger coming upon us! The Leader of the Opposition the other day said that these matters were of such grave importance that nothing should be done in a hurry. I agree with that view. It is because we wish to avoid hurry that we bring in this Bill, because in the one or two years during which the Volunteers of the country can discuss the terms, tests, and the conditions under which they would like to see some active service, it is necessary that we should have a period of leisure; and you cannot have this period of leisure unless the enabling powers of this Bill are given to the Government.

MR. HEDDERWICK (Wick Burghs): Would the exercise of the option take place on enrolment?

MR. WYNDHAM: At any time in the military life of any man if certain standards were fulfilled. I will read a draft of the kind of regulations which could be issued if enabling powers were conferred—

"A member of a Volunteer corps may contract to proceed on active service in any part of the world in a unit or company formed of Volunteers on such conditions as may be defined by the terms of his contract."

In these words "in a unit or company" which are laid down here the Government pledges itself to the intention conveyed by the words. What the Volunteers want is that they should go out as Volunteers in order to gain some experience of warfare, not to be used as drafts or as garrisons during a time of Imperial pressure. In order to avoid misconception on that point I propose in Committee to move an Amendment which will say that a particular Volunteer can subject himself to the first or both of the liabilities, because I feel that if a Volunteer is, under the terms of the Act, allowed to engage in any part of the world without reference to active military service it may be thought that it is the intention of the Government to send Volunteers to the Mediterranean or Ceylon during a period of Imperial unrest. That is not the intention of the Government; it is solely as I have described it—the terms to be discussed and the conditions to be formulated in a methodical manner under normal conditions. The inconvenience which was experienced last year can hardly be imagined. In one case a company of Volunteers was enrolled, and out of 110 men only 38 were found to conform to the tests we stipulated. We had to pay £5 to every one of those 110 men. It was not the fault of the men that they had been improperly passed, and you cannot blame people for imperfect inspection if you ask them to conduct the preliminaries in a time of war instead of, more properly, in a time of peace. Good work cannot be done under the emotion of the moment. I read in the press that if dangers come our Volunteers and every subject of the Queen would patriotically place his services at the disposal of the Government. No doubt, and all credit to them; but it is not fair to them that their services should be accepted under those conditions. Emotion will not do work which can only be done by method quietly applied. That is one of the facts we have learned from the past; it is also an intelligent forecast for the future. There is one other consideration which I cannot refrain from submitting. When introducing the Army Estimates on 12th March, I had occasion to recognise the splendid patriotism of the colonies during the recent troubles. I deprecated any dictation on our part. But if there is to be no dictation or no solicitation on our part, then I think it is our duty to set an example to our colonies. All the difficulties and inconveniences which we experienced were also experienced in our colonies. The sudden summoning of men who are Volunteers, and many who are not, the testing of them, the selection of officers, and the proper equipment during a period of emergency were as rife in the colonies as here. If we are not to solicit or dictate, let us set an example to the colonies, and show them how Volunteer efforts can be co-ordinated in time of peace so as to avoid the scrambling and pressure which obtained during last January. I should be sorry in an Act to lay down, or attempt to lay down, an exact description of the kind of contract into which such Volunteers may care to enter. It may be that when the City Imperial Volunteers come home they may desire to enter into such an arrangement as would admit of a similar course of proceeding should another occasion arise. It may be that some regiments, notably the Lancashire Fusiliers, one of the oldest in the Army, which fought at Minden, and is about to celebrate Minden day on 1st August, the Volunteer battalion may be glad and proud to be associated more intimately with the Regulars. It may be that the Volunteers of a county may wish to represent that county by amalgamating the Volunteers with the battalion. I should be sorry to say that any one of these projects should be adopted or discarded. All that I ask is that the hands of the Executive may be unfettered, so that in time of peace and leisure the wishes of the Volunteers may be gathered and some business-like plan adopted for giving effect to those wishes in time of danger. I do not think I have anything more to urge. It may be that, in spite of this unanimous Report, in spite of the experience of last winter, some may be found to construe this Act in such a way as to

suggest that the character of our Volunteer force will be changed by these provisions. That fear is not entertained by the Volunteer colonels whom we have consulted. Any such madcap project is beyond the power of this or any other Government. If these suggestions are made the Government cannot take shelter behind them in order to evade its duty. The first two objects of the Bill are necessary to the efficiency of national defence; and on that question the Government must lead. It is the duty of the Government to see that the money which the nation has lavished on our Volunteers should not be wasted; that the insurance which the country is taking is a sound one; that the Volunteers, if called upon to defend our shores, shall be given facilities for mobilisation, in the absence of which their devotion will be wholly cast away. The third point I do not put so highly, but still I earnestly recommend it to the favourable consideration of the House. In this country and in the colonies there are many men who cannot afford the time to enter the Regular Army or even the Militia, but who still wish to be ready against the hour of national danger and to prepare against that hour by taking some part in active military operations by studying in the only school, as recent events have proved, which is effective as a preparation for the military profession. You can no longer say to the Volunteers of this country, "You and you only out of all the forces of the Empire shall never see a shot fired until the enemy is at the gate"; and if you cannot say that, it is again the duty of the Government to see that such Volunteers as wish it may have a reasonable opportunity of business-like preparation. I beg to move.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Wyndham.*)

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER (Belfast, W.): I desire to oppose this Bill on two grounds—first, on the specific ground of the proposals it contains, and, secondly, because its character is such that it should not be brought in as an isolated measure at this time. The hon. Gentleman has dwelt at some length on the first part of the Bill, and I imagine there will be no objection on the part of any section of this House to the first two clauses. That sixteen representative members of the Volunteer force should have recommended the introduction of a clause which gives power to prepare, in the only way in which preparation can be made, for the performance of the duty for which Volunteers are enrolled, is not to be wondered at, for it is idle to imagine that we can utilise the Volunteers effectively for the defence of our fortresses and our ports without subjecting them to training before the actual demand is made on their services. It is only to one portion of the second clause that I object, and I will give my reasons as briefly as I can for so objecting. I object first on the merits. I do not know that that is a fatal objection, for times have changed and conditions have changed. My special objection is that it is a varying of the whole underlying principle on which the Volunteer force was originally raised. It was undoubtedly intended to be a domestic force for the protection of this country against invasion. Such an invasion was apprehended in 1859, and it was to meet that danger that the Volunteer force was raised. I do not, however, press that point, because, after all, I am one of those who are anxious that our military organisation should be varied to meet the changes in our situation. Still, I think the necessity must be clearly shown before Parliament is justified in so fundamentally altering the character of the whole Volunteer force, as is implied in the second clause of this Bill. As a matter of fact, under this Bill these men will cease to be Volunteers; they will simply be Reservists of the regular Army, and not only that, but they will be Reservists under a disqualification which does not apply to other Reservists of the Army. The present Reservist is liable to be called out by Royal Proclamation, and Parliament must meet to sanction that step within a certain specified time, but I do not see that any such obligation is imposed upon the Government with regard to the Volunteers who are dealt with by this Bill—Volunteers as you call them, but Army Reservists as I call them. I think it would be well for the House and country to understand that these men will, to all intents and purposes, with one single exception, cease to be Volunteers; they will be transferred by the Bill to the Army Reserve. Again, the Bill introduces an additional outside element into the Regular Army which, I think, is not desirable in itself. It is most desirable that we should have a perfectly homogeneous

force as our first line, and that anything done to supplement it should be by way of utilising some second line apart from the Army altogether, and not by breaking up one organisation in order to supply the deficiencies of another. I am glad to hear that the units are in all cases to be formed of Volunteers. I think, however, it is to be regretted that under this Bill the efforts of the Volunteer officers of constituted units will be absolutely thrown away. They will, no doubt, have done public service by acting as an attraction to bring young men into the corps, and in giving them that instruction which fits them to take part in the operations of the regular Army. But as colonels, majors, and captains of Volunteer units their functions will practically cease when the men are taken away from their corps. I think that will prove a serious injury to Volunteer corps themselves. The question was raised in another place as to whether the drafts taken in pursuance of this arrangement would be considered supernumerary to the corps—whether in the event of 200 Volunteers being taken away from a Volunteer battalion, they would be replaced by additions to the battalion. I understood the Secretary of State to announce that there was no intention of considering these men as supernumerary, and that their places would not be taken by others. That is unfortunate, for you will be doing exactly what was done to the disadvantage of the Militia, and at the time when the services of the Volunteer Corps may be greatly needed you will be depriving the force of the most competent of its members to serve with some other unit of which it does not form part. We have had experience of that system, and I do not believe that there is any officer, either of the Militia or of the Line, who does not share my opinion that the practice of utilising the Militia Reserve as part of the Militia in time of peace, and then suddenly in case of emergency withdrawing them, as they have been withdrawn in instances of which I am aware, has been most detrimental to the Militia battalions. I know of battalions which have been absolutely emasculated and deprived of more than half of their value by having, on embodiment, some 250 of their very best men taken from them. I should be very reluctant to see the same practice pursued in regard to the Volunteers. There is another point. It appears to me exceedingly likely that if any considerable number of men undertake these obligations they will, by doing so, seriously interfere with their employment. This question to a certain extent affects men serving in the Militia, and probably it will do so to a greater extent when the Militia are called out, as I hope they will be, for longer periods of service. But when you pass from the Militia to the Volunteers you have to deal with a very different class of men—with men in high and responsible employment, often of a confidential nature, who can ill be spared from that employment. There are numerous corps, as hon. Members know, in which there are many such men, and yet they are the very men who form the best material to take for this purpose—young, energetic, educated men, only too anxious to exercise in the field those arts which they have learned in times of peace. We have seen hundreds of them come out during the present emergency. The response which has been made by employers of skilled and unskilled labour has been magnificent, and I think the country has reason to be proud of it. The strain put upon employers has been very considerable, and I believe it is dangerous to renew that strain too often. If you do so the day may arrive when these young men may find themselves face to face with the question whether they shall still remain in their employment. That would place them in a most embarrassing position. There is another and perhaps more forcible objection to the Bill. It has been urged in its favour that it would strengthen the military service of this country. But I fail to see how it will produce the only single advantage expected from it. I strongly agree with every word said by the hon. Member the Under Secretary for War as to the necessity of organised preparation for the emergency of war in times of peace. I have been humbly preaching that doctrine for many years past. If it were really a contribution to more efficient organisation and preparation, if it gave the War Office more knowledge of the material with which it would have to deal in times of war, a knowledge which is so essential to the satisfactory carrying out of military operations, I would at once consent to the Bill. The Under Secretary for War said it was better we should do this now and not wait for a time of pressure, but the pressure will come all the same, whenever we go to

war, and, however many men enrol themselves under the provisions of this Bill, they will represent but a tithe of the number who will come forward when a real emergency threatens this country. Of course, it is very desirable that the War Office should know that it has so many Volunteers of whom it can dispose in the case of war. But, even if this Bill is passed, I do not suppose they will get any clearer idea than they already possess. They will, perhaps, have 5,000 men inscribe their names on the roll. But in a case of a real emergency, probably 50,000 will be found ready to come forward. We have already had ample evidence of that. Men will not come forward for an unforeseen contingency, whereas they will come forward for a foreseen one, and the "waiting companies" which were called for by the Secretary of State from Volunteer corps to supply the waste occasioned by the war were not raised. With hardly an exception the corps called upon to raise them failed to do so. That is an illustration in proof of my assertion. For every Englishman engaged in a civil occupation who will come forward to pledge himself to take part in a war of which he knows nothing, you will probably get twenty, thirty, or it may be a hundred Volunteers when the actual emergency arises. There is another difficulty. Suppose you get 5,000 men upon your Volunteer roll. Campaigns must now be planned in advance. To be efficient they must be planned not a day, a week or a month, but a year beforehand. But what is the objection? Five thousand men may take an obligation to-day, but in six months time every one of them by giving a fortnight's notice might get rid of his liability. But that is not quite the end of the evil. My hon. friend talks of there being no pressure; there will be pressure, and pressure of a very undesirable kind, if this Bill is passed into law. Hundreds and thousands of Volunteers are engaged in political conflicts, or at any rate hold very strong political views. It happens that we are engaged in a war which has the sympathy of the enormous majority of the people of this country, but it is quite conceivable that this country might be engaged in a war which did not at all move the feelings of the people; it might be a war to which not only an inconsiderable minority, but a very large minority would object as strongly as some hon. Members now object to the present war. In that case you would have that most unfortunate occurrence, a direct conflict between political conviction and military duty. For a soldier there is only one law — namely, whatever orders he receives, to obey them; but that is not the case with civilians in ordinary life. You will put every one of these men into the dilemma of having to undertake active service for a cause in which they may not only not believe, but which they may have actually condemned, or of doing what is most distasteful and practically impossible—namely, taking the opportunity presented by the danger to abandon the undertaking they have given, and thereby lay themselves open to the charge of not having carried out their obligations. These are serious objections, worthy of the attention of the House. But there is another objection which, from my point of view, outweighs them all. At the beginning of this session I took part in debates on the Army, and I said I was most willing to concede everything asked for by the Government by way of providing for a temporary emergency. I said that the emergency was grave, and that the safety of the country, or at any rate the safety of our Army, was imperilled, and that we could not stop to discuss the exact effect of the emergency measures then proposed. I said that the responsibility rested with the Government, that they might do what they pleased as long as they got the thing done, and I am bound to say nearly every other hon. Member took a similar view. I said at the same time that I would oppose every proposal for a permanent alteration in our military system which was undertaken apart from and without any reference to any general scheme of reorganisation. We have been told over and over again that we were not to bring these questions up during the present session, and we were told that if we did no answer would be given, as it was impossible under present conditions even to discuss the reorganisation of our Army; and yet there is a universal admission that until we have this reorganisation we are liable to a repetition of the danger which threatened us at the beginning of this year. I think it would be most illogical and most unwise to retreat from the position we then took up, and sanction one more of these everlasting emergency measures, which, however, is not an emergency measure in the sense

that it is permanent. Do not do something under the plea of emergency which may make it impossible, and will certainly make it difficult, to recast our military system as many of us believe it ought to be recast as a whole. It is not easy to discuss this matter as it ought to be discussed. I regret that the Vote for the salary of the Secretary of State for War has been withdrawn from the consideration of the House, because I believe that great organic changes ought not to be entrusted to the present Secretary of State for War in view of the language he has used, the things he has done, and the things he has left undone. But we are not to be allowed this year, when popular opinion is peculiarly directed to the duties performed by the Secretary of State for War, to discuss the exact position.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs) dissented.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I am very glad indeed if I am rightly corrected by the right hon. Gentleman, but I understood that the Vote for the salary of the Secretary of State for War was not to be included.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: It would be well, perhaps, to clear up that point, because I understood that a whole day would, if necessary, be given to it.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): My recollection is that I stated that as some seventeen days had already been given to the Army Estimates it seemed to me that either the Foreign Office Vote or the Colonial Office Vote might be discussed; but I have no objection whatever to the Vote for the salary of the Secretary of State for War being discussed, if the Votes I have mentioned are discussed at short length.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: If the Vote for the salary of the Secretary of State for War is taken, the task imposed on me will be an easier one; but that need not interfere with my present argument. If we are to have this piecemeal legislation I want to know of what system it is to form a part. The Secretary of State for War has made some statements which bear very closely on that matter. The result of this Bill when all is done will, I believe, be the addition of 5,000, 6,000, or 7,000 men at the outside to the Army Reserve; but we should be careful before sanctioning that addition to have a clear understanding as to whether the system of which that is a part is to go on. For years we have had confusion between the Line, the Militia, and the Volunteers, and no one now knows what are the special functions which these three great bodies are called upon to perform. They have been tied together by an emergency bond only. The Militia has been robbed to supply the Line, and the Volunteers have been induced by the Army recruiting sergeants to give up their recruits. We have seen the Volunteers in this campaign not as an organised military force, but simply as emergency men taken to supply the patent defects of a system which had failed to contemplate the contingencies to which we were liable. I want to know, will it be wise to take this step before we ascertain what the Secretary of State for War is going to do to rectify the condition of things he described the other day? He was asked by a noble Lord what we were doing with the hundred thousand men we had at home, and in reply he said that the noble Lord must be perfectly well aware that that hundred thousand men, or rather ninety-two thousand men, were not an organised force in any sense of the word. I quite agree they are not; but I want to know why it is not possible to have some system by which we can get an organised force without upsetting the whole organisation of the Volunteers. We have had it made perfectly clear in this House that the waste in the regular Army is so enormous that in seven years time it amounts to no less than one hundred thousand men, the whole cost of whose instruction, clothing, and housing will be lost. On the other hand, by the Secretary of State's admission, we have ninety-two thousand unorganised regular troops in this country. I think it would be infinitely better if we were to postpone this very unfortunate Bill, which is open to considerable objection, until we are able to see how far arrangements can be made for the organisation of our military forces on a scale which would be approved by the country at large. My hon. friend said that we ought to set an example to the colonies. We are all in favour of

setting an example to the colonies. We have been setting an example to the colonies for a very long time past. We have set them an example in raising regular forces for the defence of the Empire across the seas, and I think we may be perfectly content to keep this matter in our own hands. I think the colonies will not be particularly moved by anything we may do or leave undone with regard to it. For these reasons I think this Bill is not to the public advantage. I think its object is, comparatively speaking, unimportant.

MR. WYNDHAM: Does my hon. friend object to the first clause also?

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Of course not. I am a warm supporter of that first clause; my sole objection is to the second clause. I fail to realise the object with which this Bill has been introduced. I think it is in contravention of the agreement which has existed, that if it were desirable that any change should be made at present in our military system it should not be a permanent change. At any rate, I hoped that that might be the line of action that might have commended itself to the Government. I should like to say one word about an argument used by my hon. friend. He said that a large number of Volunteer officers were in favour of this Bill. I do not know whether that approval extends to the whole of the Bill, but I will assume it does. I must point out that this submission to the recommendations of a Committee is rather new at the War Office. I recollect Commissions which dealt with subjects of far greater importance than this Bill deals with, and included among their members many important personages, and yet their Reports were disregarded and pigeon-holed, and nothing was done regarding them. I can well understand the attitude of these Volunteer officers, but I believe I am quite right in saying that in this matter they are not representative, as far as the second clause is concerned, of the whole Volunteer force. It is perfectly true that they think that the years they have been serving have been wasted, and that feeling is shared by many of us. The Volunteers have felt that they have been kept under arms without organisation for no specific purpose and have not been allowed to be of any use to themselves or to the country, and I do not wonder that spirited, capable, and competent men as they are should take the first opportunity given them of showing their willingness to do anything or everything that might be asked of them. But this matter must be decided by some higher authority than the dictum of sixteen Volunteer officers. It must be decided by Parliament and by the nation, and therefore I am not moved as much as my hon. friend supposed I should be moved by the views of the Volunteer officers. Of course, they desire that we should give them employment and the opportunity of exhibiting their zeal in the interests of their country. I do hope that my hon. friend will consider whether it is absolutely imperative the the second clause of this Bill should be passed into law, and I shall move an Amendment, which I hope he will accept at a later stage, to omit that clause. I believe it will be to the interests of the country if my hon. friend confines himself to passing the first part of the Bill, which is a necessary official act to perfect the machinery of the Volunteer force. I beg to move that the Bill be read this day three months.

*CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to second the motion for the rejection of this Bill. I do so because I am of opinion that it will completely destroy the principle on which our Volunteer force is based. I am sure it will be conceded that I am one of the last who would attempt to do anything which would cripple the Government in any way during the present crisis. I have been one of those who have given the Government in conjunction with the arrangements for the present war a loyal and hearty support, and I am as anxious as any hon. Member in this House to see both our regular and auxiliary forces placed on the best possible basis. But, as the hon. Member for West Belfast has stated, this is a most inopportune time to introduce a measure of this nature. To the first clause of the Bill, which proposes to substitute for the words "actual or apprehended invasion," the words "imminent national danger or great emergency," there is no opposition. The Judge Advocate General, who is a great authority on these subjects, however, pointed out that there was great difficulty with reference to the definition of the word "emergency." I may add that the adjective "great" in the clause is tautology and altogether irrelevant. According to the Judge

Advocate General, when the Militia is embodied, then a state of emergency arises, and I think it is extremely doubtful whether the employers of this country will be parties to giving facilities to those who work under them to be called out practically as a first-class Army Reserve whenever it may seem desirable to embody the Militia. With reference to Clause 2 of the Bill, which is of great importance, the Under Secretary for War states that it is not a new project; but if it is not a new project to call upon the Volunteers to turn themselves into a military force, then I know not what a new project is. If we look back on the history of the Volunteer force we will see that it arose in a moment of grave national peril, when Napoleon was encamped on the heights of Boulogne, and a descent on these coasts was expected at any moment. This force, which arose under these circumstances, is now to be turned into a first-class Army reserve without being consulted at a whole. It is stated that sixteen colonels of Volunteers favour this measure. It would be a very strange thing if the colonels of the various Volunteer corps would not be willing to do everything they could to improve the position of their corps in the eyes of their fellow countrymen. But what proportion of the Volunteers are in favour of this change? What has been done to ascertain their opinion? Why, nothing. This Bill is being rushed on the Volunteers by a side wind; the failure in our military system is to be patched up, but the patch is a stolen piece of cloth. You are asking men who engaged under certain conditions to alter these conditions. Then it is said that no pressure will be put on the Volunteers, but I should like to know what would be thought of any man who holds back when the majority of his regiment are prepared to enlarge their liability for service. He would be looked upon as a man lacking in patriotism. That is not a fair position to place a man in who joins the Volunteer force under the impression that he is doing a patriotic act, but whose occupation and social relations are such as would not enable him to come forward. Then again, by introducing this system great damage is inflicted on recruiting for the Regular Army. Under the proposed system would not any man enter the Volunteers rather than the Regular Army? He will have the comfort and convenience of living at home and following his own occupation, and when there is an opportunity for active service he will be placed absolutely on a level with the man who has spent all his time in the Regular Army, very often doing objectionable garrison duty. I say that is most unfair, and that it will injure recruiting for the Regular Army. Like the hon. Member for West Belfast I am not as anxious with reference to the Volunteers as I am regarding the defensive system of the country as a whole. We have reason to hope that on the conclusion of the war our entire military system will be recast; therefore there is no necessity at the present moment to introduce this wretched measure, which will only give 5,000 or 10,000 men at the outside on whom you can draw in case of emergency. Then, again, you will create classes in the Volunteers, which I am sure every military man will acknowledge will not be for the good of the regiments themselves. You will have three different classes: first, the Volunteer, who serves at home, and who is liable to go away by giving a fortnight's notice—he will not be looked on as a soldier at all—second, the man who is liable to be called out on active service at any time; and, third, the man who is liable to serve in any part of the world, whether within or without Her Majesty's dominions. In fact, you are going to introduce into the Volunteers the system which now exists in the Army—a system of robbing Peter to pay Paul; of cutting off the end of the blanket and adding it on to the top, but you will not have a man more. Every commanding officer of Militia is at the present moment loud in his complaints that his best officers and men are taken from him as soon as they are trained, and are sent to join the linked battalion abroad, or that all his recruits as soon as they are effective are drafted to other battalions in South Africa. The result of this measure will be to stop recruiting for the Militia. With regard to the political aspect the hon. Member for West Belfast very fairly pointed out the results which would follow in the event of a member of the Volunteer force being asked to take part in what might be, on the whole, a somewhat unpopular war. The system proposed in the Bill reminds one of the system which prevails in certain Irish establishments where, when a particular servant,

Captain Norton.

whose duty it is to do a particular class of work, fails, another servant whose duties are altogether different is called in to act, and the result is, of course, blank failure. The basis of the Volunteer Bill of 1895 was to disturb as slightly as possible the conditions under which the Volunteers were then serving the State; but this Bill goes, as it were, in the very teeth of that policy, and is framed in such a manner as to disturb the conditions on which the Volunteer force was formed. The Bill will secure no good purpose and may ruin our existing Volunteer system, and for these reasons I beg to second the motion of the hon. Member for West Belfast.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'" — (*Mr. Arnold-Forster.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: It is not very often I have the good fortune to agree with the hon. Member for West Belfast in our discussions on these matters, and even to-day I cannot say that I sympathise with every word he has uttered, but with his main position in regard to this Bill, I am entirely in sympathy. The hon. Member for West Belfast brought up a sort of self-denying ordinance, supposed to be imposed on us all, that we were not, during the present session, while military affairs were in so urgent a condition as they have been, to enter upon the much larger questions of future organisation and future reform. I think there is a good deal of strength in the position which the hon. Gentleman has taken up, even in that limited sense; but there is another and larger ground on which I think that this is a most inexpedient occasion for us to begin with piecemeal alterations in the innermost constitution of the different branches of the defensive forces of this country. The Under Secretary referred to some words I used a day or two ago protesting against doing anything in a hurry, and he argued that this Bill was intended to avoid things being done in a hurry —that is to say, that administrative acts would not be accomplished in so scrambling a fashion as was necessary last winter if this Bill were passed. That is quite possible; but I had reference to the action of the Government, of the House, and of Parliament when I spoke of not doing anything in a hurry, and I think I am supported in my view by some words which fell from the Secretary of State for War last night in another place. The Secretary of State was meeting a demand on the part of a noble Duke for the reorganisation and reconstitution of the Army and the War Office, and among the other pleas he urged was this—that there are now in South Africa a number of the very men whom it would be most essential that we should consult if it were found necessary to enter upon any change on a great scale, and that we ought to wait until we could get the great benefit of the actual experience and wise advice of those who have seen the operation of the present system in the field. I put that very wise sentiment and warning of the Secretary of State in another place against himself or his representative in this House, and I say that I think the present time is not the moment in which to make great changes, even if those changes can be shown to be salutary and wise in themselves. The House and the country have shown themselves, during the last eight or nine months, willing to do and to agree to anything that the Government proposed to meet the emergency that has arisen; but from that disposition on the part of the House, which is a loyal and wise and, I think, a most discreet disposition, to pass to the idea that the experience of last winter is to form a basis of all we are to do for the Army in the future, that that is to be considered as representing the normal requirements in any case of war of the British Army, is to take a step which I do not think anything in the world can justify. We have had to meet a most exceptional enemy, such as may not be met with in any other part of the world, as we all know. We had to meet that enemy in a great state of unpreparedness, because we, the Government, Parliament, and people, had undervalued the difficulty of the task we took in hand, and, therefore, we were put to great straits last winter, and we had to take hold of any man who offered himself and put him into some place in order to take advantage of his patriotic and generous spirit. But it does not follow that on a future occasion we should be exposed to any such necessity, because if you are to pursue a policy of expansion all over the world, we have had a lesson during the last two or three months which shows the

sort of force we should have to maintain in order to cope with that policy of expansion; but if, on the other hand, we are to pursue a more modest and, as I think, more reasonable policy, let us hope that such necessities as occurred last winter will not arise again. I do not wish to prejudge the great question of the condition of the Army and the military necessities of the country. I do not say it will not be necessary to make great changes and to make great additions to our military strength. It is quite possible that that may be so, but we are not in a position now to deal with that question, and that is what I wish to urge on the House. We have a limited experience in the emergency of last winter, and upon that experience alone we are now called upon, as I think, to fundamentally alter the whole condition and spirit of the Volunteer force. There was another thing which happened during last winter. I have said our enemy was an unusual enemy in his fighting qualities, and the necessities, therefore, that were laid upon us in the circumstances were unusul. But another thing that was unusual was the remarkable and most laudable effort that was made by the employers of labour to meet the wants that were shown in our military defences. Men were allowed to go away on terms which were freely offered throughout the country. But can we be sure that similar terms will be offered in future? Can we be sure that the circumstances that occurred last winter will not seriously affect the relations between the civil employer and the Reserve man, the Militiaman and the Volunteer? I do not wish to be a Cassandra, and say that that will happen; but, at all events, we must bear in mind that the sudden emergency of last winter evoked a spirit of self-sacrifice and of patriotism which may not always be preserved at the same pitch in time of peace. The Under Secretary has also laid his case partly upon the Report of the Committee which sat a few years ago. But I notice that in the recommendations of the Committee there is not a word about foreign service for Volunteers. There is a reference to active service, but not to foreign service.

MR. WYNDHAM: I hope I did not convey the impression that I quoted the Report in support of foreign service. On the other hand, I divided, as clearly as I could, the first half of the section from the second part of the section.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Then the hon. Gentleman does not adduce the authority of the Committee in support of the second section?

MR. WYNDHAM: No, Sir.

*SIR HENRY FLETCHER (Sussex, Lewes): As a member of that Committee, perhaps I may be allowed to say that we had no instructions whatever to consider the question of foreign service.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: This Committee made its report, and immediately afterwards a Bill was introduced into the House carrying out the recommendations as far as they could be carried out, amending the law for calling out the Volunteers for actual military service. So that it is not the case that nothing has been done to meet the desires of the Committee.

MR. WYNDHAM: I pointed out that the Chairman of that Committee, in the debate on that very Bill, recognised that the recommendations of the Committee had not been carried out in their entirety. He said he hoped they would not be lost sight of, and joined with those who regarded the Bill simply as an instalment. Some of the prominent members of the Committee expressed the greatest regret that the Bill brought in by the right hon. Gentleman did not include the recommendations of the Committee.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am sure that the Bill embodied all the suggestions of the Committee which commended themselves to those who were best acquainted with the feelings and the necessities of the Volunteer corps in their administrative relations with the War Office. I am also pretty sure of this, that the suggestions of a Committee, in a case like that, do not necessarily involve their recognition and adoption by the Government of the day or by Parliament. The Committee was formed, for the most part, of strong and energetic Volunteers, who, no doubt, were anxious to see certain changes introduced; but it does not follow that the opinions of a few colonels of Volunteer corps, however eminent, and zealous, must carry the day. We are bound to look at questions of this kind from the civilian as well as from the Volunteer point of view.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Chairman, the Financial Secretary to the War Office, was a civilian.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I know; but at any rate a Committee does not convey such overpowering weight that we must accept its opinions without hesitation. Even Royal Commissions to inquire into military matters are sometimes treated to but little attention; and we have had one or two Royal Commissions upon the licensing question whose Reports have been received with nothing but scorn and contumely from the supporters of the Government So that I really think the authority of the Committee can be carried too far; and the House is perfectly free to act in this matter without being completely carried away by the recommendations of the Committee. The hon. Gentleman adduced one or two cases in which changes are necessary, but chiefly with regard to the first clause; I mean the question of Volunteer artillery manning the forts which defend the commercial harbours of this country, the submarine mines, and so forth. That is true, and it may be a very necessary thing to take such steps as may be required to give them more ample time than other branches of the Volunteer service for preparation for the efficient fulfilment of the duties imposed upon them. But surely that does not justify sweeping changes of this kind which will affect all the Volunteer corps throughout the kingdom. The Volunteer forces were originally instituted for the purpose of the defence of these shores; they have always been treated as a force originated and intended for that purpose, and they have been spoken of in our after-dinner speeches, even when we are most effusive, under that limitation. Is there any one of us who has not, after dinner, declared that "Defence, not defiance," is the motto of the Volunteers? And, as my hon. friend has said, if *in vino veritas* has any force, then after dinner is the very time when we get at the kernel of the matter. The Volunteers were instituted, and they have been maintained, for the defence of these islands. But the Government now propose to introduce three separate classes into the Volunteers. There are those who only undertake the old duties; there are those who undertake the liability of being called out for actual military service at any time; and there are those who may be called out to serve in any part of the world. I agree with what has been said, that it is most undesirable to have two or three kinds of men serving in the same corps with different liabilities, if it can be at all avoided. There may be instances where there is a limited necessity for cases of that kind, such as the Militia reserve; but I always thought that the Army was against the Militia reserve, because its effect upon the Army might be bad. It was, however, a necessity; but where was the necessity here, in order to obtain the services of a few men, of introducing a distinction among them? I have no doubt there are many high-spirited young men in the Volunteers who would be glad to undertake actual military service; but the question is, Is it desirable from a public point of view to allow them to do it and to separate them from the rest of their comrades? I do not think it is. The Under Secretary for War seemed to think he made things rather better when he went on to say that those who undertook the liability of serving in any part of the world would only be called upon to do so in the case of actual military service. "Of course," said the hon. Gentleman, "we should never think of putting them to garrison duty, or to other humdrum occupations of that kind, which would not give them the chance of winning glory and distinction. It is only in active warfare that they would obtain a knowledge of their duties; let us send them to the front." It does not occur to him to ask "What becomes of the Regular force and of the Militia?" I suppose the Militia are only to garrison forts such as Sierra Leone, while the Volunteers must be reserved for the front.

MR. WYNDHAM: I do not recognise my own arguments in the right hon. Gentleman's version of them.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I know. I am putting them purposely in an exaggerated way to show how dangerous they are. But does it not come to this: that you are to select from one force a number of high-spirited young fellows, and put them, in preference to other forces, to do certain duties of an attractive kind? They are, in fact, to be put in front of the Army and Militia Reservists. I really do not think a case for this Bill has been made out. I should be willing indeed to see the slight alteration made with regard to Section 17

of the Volunteer Act of 1863. That, of course, is a good thing, because it gets rid of the somewhat pedantic difficulty of publicity which is undesirable. I would be glad to see anything done which would really increase the utility and efficiency of the Volunteers, but I do not think the institution among them of two or three classes of men with different liabilities would mean any real or substantial increase in their efficiency. It could not increase their efficiency except in a reflex way—that these young fellows would go out and see active service and when they came back would leaven the battalion in which they serve. But we are not going to make war gaily every year in order to give fine high-spirited young fellows the opportunity of seeing active service. The Bill is founded on a wrong conception. Last winter there was a great emergency, and the hon. Gentleman seems to have been very much impressed by the wild tone of feeling shown in the public press. I do not go so much by the tone of the public press. I am sure the thinking people of the country agree that everything should be done in an emergency to meet the case. But that is a very different thing from enlisting men in one force and promptly passing them into another, so that the Army and the whole defensive force—the Militia, the Volunteers, and the Yeomanry—are so mixed up that no one can tell when you meet a man in the street to which force he belongs. I hope the hon. Gentleman will not press, at all events, this clause of the Bill. This is not the time for us to be meddling with these things. We want more ample opportunities and more ample advice from those who have come through the experience of war before we attempt to tinker with our military system. For the present it is better to be content with the humbler duty of filling up the ordinary necessities of the Army in war, and to leave the reorganisation and reconstitution of it to quieter times.

*Sir J. COLOMB (Great Yarmouth): If I saw anything in this Bill which could be characterised as a fundamental change in our organised system, I should vote against it. But I do not see that. We have heard objections made that it is a fundamental change in the constitution of our voluntary service, but I cannot share that view. The Bill is simply permissive and administrative in its action. Volunteers can now go on active service upon giving fourteen days notice, and resigning their Volunteer position and enlisting in the Militia or the regular Army, and this Bill simply provides for administrative convenience in dealing with the case of Volunteers who are desirous of going on active service, and enables the War Office to know beforehand what proportion of the Volunteer force would wish to hold themselves liable for general service all over the world. I cannot conceive that there can be the slightest objection to Clause 1, it is simply an alteration that is necessary; and I cannot understand how Members of this House who have given ten minutes thought to the question of why the Volunteers are in existence and what the work is they have to perform can hesitate for a moment to accept it. With regard to the first part of Clause 2, which enables Volunteers to arrange to hold themselves in readiness to be called upon to serve at any time, that is, for the purposes of administrative arrangements, as to the defence of certain of our ports, it is a good principle; but where the difficulty comes in is in the sub-section B of Clause 2. Upon that point the proposer of the motion to reject the Bill and his seconder objected on two or three grounds, but to my mind they did not follow out their own arguments when they estimated the number of men likely to avail themselves of this Bill at 10,000 only, when one remembers that the Volunteer force is over a quarter of a million men. A Bill that provides for the wishes of Volunteers who desire to serve abroad is a good Bill, and I cannot think such consequences are going to happen as are suggested by the hon. Gentlemen if it only affects 3 or 4 per cent. of that force. I therefore cannot share their view. Another objection which they took was that we might have an unpopular war, and that trouble might then happen if these men were called out against their convictions to perform the obligations which they undertook; but that would also apply to the Army Reserve. I cannot see in this respect any difference between the Regular Army, Militia, Army Reserve, and the Volunteers. When a man enters into a contract with the Government he must, when called upon, put his convictions in his pocket and fulfil his contract; therefore, I cannot agree with that view. Another

objection raised was that of filling the vacancies of units of the Volunteer corps who hold themselves liable under this Bill for general service. I think if it is contended that for the necessities of this country 260,000 Volunteers are required for our local defences, although we may have supreme power at sea, then I say I do not acknowledge the contention and do not agree with it. If 10,000 hold themselves in readiness to go abroad, it merely means in any case an increase of the Volunteer strength. But I think that 260,000 are more than sufficient if you have supreme command at sea, therefore I do not pay much attention to the objection or to the arguments that I have heard in opposition to this Bill. But I am bound to say that to come down here and take the Bill as it stands and give my hearty support to it is another thing. I give my hearty support to the first clause, and to that part of the second clause which enables a certain proportion of men that may be necessary to be called upon in times of emergency to hold themselves liable for service. I thoroughly accept those two points, and I was prepared to accept the third point without hesitation until I heard a remark dropped by the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary, and that frightened me, and is why I now hold my vote back in respect to that part of the Bill. He said that, of course, in the case of those men who volunteer for service abroad, we should never think of asking them to do anything else but go to the front; that we should not ask them to go into garrisons or act in any disagreeable work in keeping lines of communication, etc., and that this Bill would only apply to those who held themselves liable for service, but only to go to the front, and that we should arrange for the Regulars or the Militia to do the disagreeable work. If we cannot call upon them except to go to the front, that strikes at the very root of our military system. It is not for the men to say where they will go, whether it be to the front, where all the excitement is, or at the rear, where all is dreary and the work is hard. They must do their duty, and with regard to this part of the clause I shall certainly have to vote against it, unless there is some further explanation from the hon. Gentleman. I cannot sufficiently express my feelings at the idea of making a man liable to serve as a military unit on the condition that he is only to serve at the front, and the remarks of the hon. Gentleman have actually turned my vote against this part of the Bill which I came down to support. To my mind if this Bill is passed we must be very clear as to how it is going to work. We must be exceptionally clear as to what we are doing. I think that these men, if they hold themselves liable for service, should do so without qualification, and unless that matter is cleared up I cannot vote for Sub-section B, Clause 2, of the Bill. Now, coming back to the part of the Bill of which I do approve, I cannot exactly understand why the period should be for one month. My hon. friend said, and I thought he spoke having regard to particular circumstances, that during critical negotiations when danger was imminent was not the time to call out the whole of the Volunteers; but negotiations do not end in a month; but if, for the reasons, he stated, we cannot call out the whole force, he says we must be able to call out part of the force without observation or making a scare. But why limit it to a month? A period arrives in negotiations when it becomes necessary for the Government in its discretion to say. We must look to the safety of our ports and call out these men, but at the end of the month negotiations are going on still, and at the end of the month the Government will have to disband these men or mobilise the whole of the force. It is the Memorandum of the hon. Gentleman which frightens me. We are told distinctly that at present we should have to call out the whole force, and naturally that would be a difficult thing to do; therefore the Government must have power to call out a portion of the men, but why limit it to a month? That is against the proposal of the Government. A month is not in the Bill, but we have been supplied with the draft of the proposed Volunteer regulations. If my hon. friend tells me the Government are not bound by that term, but can keep these men, when called out, as long as they like, my objection falls. Now we have obtained information on many points, but in one particular that information is lacking. We lack information as to what is the period for which a Volunteer is to be liable after he has accepted the obligation. I can find nothing in the Bill at all with regard to that. I see it says between the ages of eighteen and thirty-five. Does that mean that a man of thirty-four years of age, having had two years training in the

Volunteers, can be accepted under this Bill, and, if so, for how long? I think the Bill in principle is perfectly sound to this extent, that it is an attempt to retrieve the past errors of our military system. We have now for forty years been acting on the principle that we must have a vast number of armed men in this country to guard against the danger of an invasion, and upon that force we have spent a vast sum of money, the result being that we have spent this vast amount upon a principle which is the absolute negation of our naval supremacy. It is an attempt to get the men of this secondary force, which is not wanted here, to hold themselves in readiness for over-sea service. I do not see that the allegation that it is an interference with the Volunteer Act has the shadow of a foundation. I am prepared to vote for the whole of the Bill with the exception of Sub-section B of Clause 2, which I cannot vote for.

*Mr. HEDDERWICK said that this Bill raised grave issues and reflections. In spite of what had fallen from the hon. and gallant Gentleman opposite, to whose opinion on matters of this kind he attached the greatest possible respect, he thought that the Bill, if passed, would have a profound effect upon the character of the Volunteer force. If the Government asked the Volunteers upon enrolment whether they were willing to serve abroad, if need be, they would immediately divide the Volunteer force into two classes, those who preferred to stay at home and those who were willing to serve abroad, and the result in time would inevitably be that a very large proportion of the youth of the country who would gladly, under present conditions, join the force, but who could not tell what their position would be in a few years, would be prevented from joining the Volunteers. If, on the other hand, the Government did not intend to put that question upon enrolment, but were prepared to leave it until the emergency arose, then the force of that objection he admitted would be greatly diminished. The hon. Member for Yarmouth had said truly that in a Bill of this kind we ought to be very clear as to what we were going to do. It appeared to him that it was impossible for the House to take such an intelligent view of the result of their action if they adopted the Bill, for a reason which he commended to the consideration of the hon. and gallant Member. The terms of the contract under which the Volunteers were to contract with the State were not before the House. They were not in the Bill. The hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary only touched upon them to drop them; but if it was desirable that the House should be clear as to what steps were to be taken, it was essential that the terms of the contract, which were all-important, should be stated in the Bill itself. On those grounds he thought the House was not in a position to judge adequately what would be the effect of the proposals of the Government. By passing the Bill the House would in fact be giving a blank cheque to the War Office. Another point which forced itself upon his mind was this. He could not imagine why a Bill of such far-reaching importance should be brought in at such a late period of the session. The Bill emanated from the War Office owing to the emergency in the Transvaal, but that emergency had passed away so far as the Volunteer service was concerned. He agreed with the hon. Member for West Belfast that if anything was going to be done to reform the military system of this country this was not the way to commence. We should begin with the War Office, which everybody agreed required reform. Instead of adopting that reasonable course the Government appeared to be throwing up the Volunteers as a last entrenchment. He was surprised that the hon. Gentleman, who was familiar with military matters, should quote the opinion of sixteen Volunteer colonels as if it were a sufficient defence or justification for such a Bill. Upon those grounds, and those grounds alone, he felt himself compelled to oppose the Bill.

General GOLDSWORTHY (Hammersmith) said that with regard to a great portion of the Bill there was entire agreement, but there was one portion with which he could not agree, and that was the part which asked the Volunteers to serve in any part of the world, within or without Her Majesty's dominions. His objection to it was owing to the explanation of the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary. The Volunteers were for home defence, and if home defence were weakened the Government would do wrong. Under the present system if any of the Volunteers desired to serve abroad there was nothing to prevent them. Everybody who knew anything

about the War Office was aware that when a war occurred there was an immense strain put upon the War Office because of the want of organisation, and he did not think that the reform of that Department should be postponed. He thought a great portion of the Bill would be very useful, and he supported the Second Reading with the hope that the Government would see their way to modify Sub-section B of Clause 2. He agreed with the hon. Member for Wick, who declined to give the Government a blank cheque, and thought that the House ought to know what they were going to do. There was one thing to be guarded against, which was the jealousy it would give rise to between the Volunteers and the Militia. All the forces ought to work harmoniously for the good of the country, and great care ought to be taken that there should be no petty jealousy between them.

CAPTAIN SINCLAIR (Forfarshire) desired to add a few words in support of the objections which had been raised to the Bill. It was a remarkable fact that the support which had been given to the measure was of the most qualified description; but everybody agreed that it was unfortunate that the Bill should have been brought forward at so inopportune a time. There appeared to be a concensus of opinion that at the time when the country had made great efforts in connection with the South African war the judgment of the House was not sufficiently unbiassed to deal with this matter. But the Bill was inopportune for another reason. The whole country had already made great sacrifices, and it did not seem to be appropriate that this particular time should be chosen by the Government to introduce a measure which would increase the burden of the Volunteer military service. The hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary, perhaps, would meet that criticism and justify his action by saying that the Government had taken every step possible for them to take, and that they had consulted well-known persons upon the subject. Sixteen officers had been consulted; but surely a very much larger consultation was required in a matter of this kind. It was necessary to get in touch with many more regiments throughout the country, and those civilians who were connected with our military service in some way or other, and not only those but the whole civil population. Further time and further inquiry were necessary before any organic change was made in the Volunteer law. The Under Secretary for War had, in meeting the criticisms in the administration of the War Office, said that any organic change could not be expected to be taken at present. That was the view taken by the greater portion of the country. There were many important lessons to be learnt from a war like this. Any declaration of that kind which had been made would not seem to justify the Government in bringing forward this Bill or any other measure of a similar character. As no objection had been raised to Clause 1 he did not know that he need trouble the House with any observations upon it, but he expressed a wish to be informed as to whether the Volunteer Act of 1895, which gave power to the Government to call out a portion of the Volunteer force upon the embodiment of the Militia, did not meet all the necessities of the case. Great stress had been laid upon the fact of the Government being able to move certain bodies of men in case of an emergency or conflict with any other Powers; but before moving the Volunteers surely the preliminary step of embodying the Militia would be taken. And, if so, the Volunteers could be moved under the present law after the Militia had been embodied. Why were these new powers needed in respect to Clause 1? The Bill struck at the root of our present system. In the beginning of the year large bodies of Volunteers had been sent over the seas, and that had left the country insufficiently protected, and now the Government had introduced a measure designed to place more men at their disposal in case of emergency—that was the effect of it, whatever might have been the intention—it placed more men at the disposal of the Government for any action which they might take abroad. A great deal had been heard about Empire during the present year, but let not the House forget the nation, and that home defence was, after all, one of the most responsible and essential parts of our organisation. This scheme of the Government cut into the scheme of home defence and weakened the country in its most vital part. If it was necessary to increase the military force, how was it that nothing had been heard of that intermediate force, the Militia? The present Bill merely laid new burdens on the backs of the Volunteers, and trenched

on the resources of the country for home defence. The Government on the question of raising men for foreign service had passed over the Militia and gone to the Volunteers. He hoped as the result of the discussion the Bill would not be proceeded with at this time.

MR. SEELY (Lincoln) thought that although the Government had been wise to raise this question they would best serve the interests of the country and the Volunteers by not proceeding further with the Bill now. With regard to the first section, it was a very strong thing to alter the conditions of service of 250,000 men in time of war, and although the Government said they did not intend to call out such a number, still, this Bill made a considerable difference in the law. It might be used in future in a very different manner from that in which the original words could be used, and for a different purpose than that for which the Volunteers originally engaged. Therefore, it was incumbent on the Government to make it perfectly clear that such a step was necessary, not simply for administrative convenience, but for the defence of the country. He did not think in that case the country would object, but it was necessary that such an assurance should be given. He should like to know how many Volunteers offered themselves for garrison duty at the beginning of the year, and whether the reason that their services were not accepted was to be found in the legal difficulty, or whether the reason was that their services were not required. If such a difficulty existed, the first clause of the Bill was a necessity, but if not the proposed alteration ought to be very carefully considered. It seemed very like mixing up the duties of the Volunteers and the Militia. He always thought the Volunteers were regarded as for home defence, but the fact did not appear to be appreciated by the Government. As to Clause 2, the Government would probably see the wisdom of withdrawing it for the present. There was a great deal to be said against it; and if the Government wanted men from the Volunteers there would never be any difficulty in getting them. As to the "scandal of the scramble" in the beginning of the year, that could never be avoided by any alteration of the terms of service when the Government entered upon a war with the idea that they only needed 70,000 men, and then suddenly discovered that at least 230,000 would be required. He hoped the Under Secretary would satisfy the House as to the point he raised, and would consider very carefully the questions raised on the sub-section.

MR. WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield) said he should not have intervened in the debate except for the fact that he sat upon the Committee which was supposed to have supported the Bill. He wished to draw attention to two points. The first was the liability of the Volunteers to be called out in times of great national danger. If it was admitted that it was necessary to call out the Volunteers, a man might be able to give a month of his time, but he could not give the whole year without considerably injuring his prospects. At one time it was thought that no man ought to be considered a soldier unless he came under military law, but in South Africa it had been abundantly proved that a man could shoot and fight without ever having come under military law. A great proportion of the Volunteer force were well trained, but the greater proportion were not trained as soldiers. He had seen a good many Volunteer corps for both long and short periods in camps, and he had also seen a good deal of Army and Militia training, and he had come to the conclusion that unless men came under military law, they could not be depended upon. One brigade of Volunteers at some manœuvres he witnessed had had an exhausting field day, and they drilled perfectly well up to a point, but about mid-day the Volunteers began to fall out and sat down, as they said they had gone far enough, and there was no means of punishing those men for refusing to work. For this reason he thought that the recommendations of the Committee as embodied in the first clause would be beneficial to the force; but there was this point against it: that the moment unpleasant conditions were imposed on the Volunteers fewer men would be forthcoming, although the smaller number might be more efficient. The new phase in this question was the liability to foreign service. He believed that it would be injurious to the Volunteer force, for it would have the effect of dividing each corps into three sections, each a separate unit requiring a separate officer to keep it efficient. This foreign service provision ought to be applied to the Militia before

it was applied to the Volunteers. The Militia should be the second line of defence and the Volunteers the third. It would also have an injurious effect upon recruiting. Another reason why this clause should not be passed was the absurdity of it. The Government had proved that for themselves. In the earlier part of the year, when they asked for Volunteers for foreign service they had as many men as they required, and if this Clause 2 had then been the law it would not help them to get more. The second clause was so objectionable that it ought to be taken out of the Bill. The Bill was a very important one, but it would be wise on the part of the Government to reconsider their position as to passing it this session. At the present moment all the great leaders were in South Africa, and all the War Office authorities were engaged in work in connection with South Africa, or ought to be; and when a radical change of this character was going to be made the whole of those people ought to be consulted. If that was not necessary, why were not the War Office reforms carried out that were so much required? The whole system had broken down and had not worked smoothly, although it had done a good deal more than it was expected it would do. The Government were ready to tinker up the Volunteers, but were not ready to undertake real reforms with regard to the War Office, because it was said that all the important people were away. Was not this Bill a part of the reform? Yet this Bill was to be passed without delay. The moment the war was over the recruiting for the Army would fall so low that they would have difficulty in getting men. He thought that before anyone who had the good of the Volunteer force at heart could honestly support the Bill, the Government ought to give a pledge that they would limit Sub-section (*a*) of Clause 2 to service in Great Britain and Ireland. If they did so, most of the mischief would be taken out of the Bill.

MR. WYNDHAM: The hon. and gallant Member who spoke last is in favour of the passing of the Second Reading of this Bill. He shares the opinion of my hon. friend the Member for Lincoln that to remove the public declaration as to the apprehension of invasion is to destroy the Volunteer force as an instrument for defence. We are all agreed about that. He concluded his speech by saying that if the Government would give a pledge that the men who offered for service under Sub-section (*a*) of Clause 2 were only to serve in Great Britain, he would support that.

MR. WARNER: May I make a correction? I did not say only to serve in Great Britain, but I said only to undertake the condition of being liable to be called out for service in Great Britain.

MR. WYNDHAM: I think that follows *ipso facto* on the Bill. I must say it has given me the greatest satisfaction to find that there is almost a unanimous assent to the two important objects of the Bill, which I described in my speech. The third object of the Bill has been much criticised, and naturally criticised, for I admit it is a novelty. I draw a clear distinction between the two main objects and the third object, which I have described as a matter not so much of importance as of method and convenience. I still hold to my own opinion that something must be done to avoid in future what I call the scandal of the scramble which took place in January. It is clear that we ought to think out these things in time of peace, and arrive at a businesslike and smooth form to be employed in time of war. Of course, I cannot claim that the third object is one of anything like the urgency of the first two propositions. That being so, I am not going to enter into an elaborate reply to arguments which rest on the fallacy that I attach great importance to this proposal for the purpose of getting a Reserve for the Army. That is not so. But as I think there is force in the argument that we should wait for the return of the Volunteers who have gone out to the Cape before we invite Volunteers, as we do in Sub-section (b) to subject themselves to liability "to serve in any part of the world, whether within or without Her Majesty's dominions," the Government will not press that Sub-section. As regards Sub-section (a) the liability "to be called out for actual military service at any time," we propose to limit that to the United Kingdom. With those modifications, I ask the House to agree to the second reading.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Let us understand exactly where we are. I understand that the hon. Gentleman implies that Sub-section (b) of Clause 2 will not be pressed. But what about Sub-section (a)—will it be pressed?

MR. WYNDHAM ; Yes.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN : In the broad sense in which it stands they may be called out for military service at any time.

MR. WYNDHAM : I endeavoured in my speech this morning to show that you cou'd not modify the provision in the Volunteer Act unless by using general terms, and that then under those terms you could issue restrictive regulations. That is the way in which it should be done, and I humbly submit, if the right hon. Gentleman will allow me, that the point could be argued more conveniently in Committee if we are agreed on the object.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN : It is an important object, I admit. I hope the Government will consider whether it requires such a sweeping phrase as this, that all the Volunteers everywhere are to be subject to be called out for service at any time. I think that is an alarming proposition.

MR. WYNDHAM : I am quite willing to argue that point in Committee.

*SIR HENRY FLETCHER : I have listened to this debate in a double position—as having been a member of the Committee which has been alluded to, and which sat six years ago, and also as having served in Her Majesty's Volunteer force since 1859. I do hope the House will accept the explanation of the hon. Gentleman, and allow the Bill to be read a second time, leaving out those parts he has alluded to. I can assure the House that I did not intend to take any part in the debate until I heard the explanation that has just been given by my hon. friend the Under Secretary for War. I felt that the sub-section designated (b) in Clause 2 could not receive the support of those who had the interest of the Volunteer force at heart. Now, owing to the explanation given to us, I feel relieved in my mind, and I consider that what is proposed to be done will be not only for the benefit of the Volunteers, but also for the benefit of the country at large.

COMMANDER BETHELL (Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness) : I wish to call attention to one feature of Sub-section (a), to which my hon. friend thinks he has received the assent of the House. I shall confine myself entirely to Sub-section (a). What the Government want to do, I understand, is to be able to call out the Volunteers for military service at any time. They cannot do that under the present Act, and they propose to get over the difficulty by saying that Volunteers shall come under an obligation to be called out for actual military service at any time. Objection has been taken to that, because it is felt that it classifies Volunteers. I agree with those who say that it is extremely objectionable that in our civic force we should have some men who have a liability different from others. I want to submit to my hon. friend the Under Secretary for War whether the object of the Government would not be met by so altering the law that the Government may accept the services of Volunteers at any time without placing anyone under previous obligation to give them. In the moment of emergency you want a number of men. As the Bill now stands you can only accept those men who are under previous liability to join. Surely there is no object in that. The proposal is open to the objection that you classify the Volunteers in two separate sections. I would suggest that you should alter the law so as to give the Government power to accept the services of Volunteers if they choose. You would then have the corps intact as it is at present, and at the same time open wide the door for them to offer their services in time of emergency. I am persuaded that that would be a much better and more popular reform to make in this direction. I would urge my hon. friend to consider the aspect of the question I have just now alluded to.

MR. BROADHURST (Leicester) asked whether in the event of Sub-section (a) of Clause 2 becoming law, present Volunteers would require to be enlisted.

MR. WYNDHAM : That is not so. They do not enlist. They enrol.

COLONEL WELBY (Taunton) asked whether there would be provision for a Volunteer taking himself out of the list by giving certain notice.

MR. WYNDHAM : Certainly.

CAPTAIN SINCLAIR (Forfarshire) asked whether it was or was not the case that the passing of Clause 1. of the Bill would impose fresh obligations upon Volunteers now serving. Was

it not the case that it would not be binding on them unless they were willing to enter into these new obligations?

MR. WYNDHAM: I cannot go into these questions on the Second Reading.

SIR HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.) said it was a question whether they should not press this to a division if they did not clearly understand the intention of the Government. What he understood was that Sub-section (*a*) of Clause 2 would be confined to the United Kingdom, and, secondly, that the hon. Gentleman dropped Sub-section (*b*) altogether. That was not open to argument.

MR. JOHN BURNS (Battersea) said he should like to know from the Under Secretary for War in what way the consent of the Volunteers was to be given, whether it would be by individual contract or by the colonel commanding. Would it be possible, for example, for the colonel of a Volunteer battalion to call out his 800 men on parade, and, after an ultra-patriotic speech, say, "Now, all you men who are willing to go on active service march to the front"—the effect being to make all the men who stay behind to appear more or less unpatriotic or cowardly?

MR. WYNDHAM: Assuredly not. There will be a separate contract with each individual man. If the House will allow the Second Reading to-day I shall deal with all these points in Committee.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER asked leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Main Question put, and agreed to. Bill read a second time, and committed for To-morrow.

RESERVE FORCES BILL [Lords].

[SECOND READING]

Order for Second Reading read.

MR. WYNDHAM: I think there need be very few words said in moving the Second Reading of this Bill. It has two objects. In the first place, it will abolish the present restrictions in the use of the supplemental section of the Army Reserve. At present, under the Reserve Forces Act of 1882, Reservists of a certain category can only be got at when the whole of Sections B and C have been exhausted. Many difficulties arising out of that division have been revealed during the war. In the first place, on 20th December we had to call out 8,000 men of Sections B and C who were not needed. I think the House will see that that is very hard on everybody. It is hard on the taxpayer, who has to pay the man full pay when he is not doing full work; it is hard on the Reservist, who has, perhaps, thrown up his employment and is not wanted but sent back; it is hard on his wife, whose arrangements are dislocated by receiving separation allowance for a few days and then the allowance ceasing; it is hard on the charitable associations which have come forward with such humanity to assist in these matters; and it is hard on the officer in charge of the mobilisation, who, at a time when the depôt is already clogged with men, has to deal with additional men for whom he has no need; and it is hard on regimental tradition. I think that, while preserving the principle that we should take the men who last left the Army first, we ought to apply that principle to regiments and not to the whole of the Reserve. If you want a few Reservists you fall back on the men who left a year ago, and, if you want more, you take the men who left two years ago.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Wyndham.*)

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I think the main object of this Bill is one that can be accepted. There is only one point that I am doubtful about, and it is a humble and sordid question. There are two classes of men who have different obligations. One class get 6d. a day and the other class get 4d. a day. Supposing I have served in a regiment in which you have a great many sixpenny men, and I personally am not called upon until you have exhausted all the sixpenny men in the other regiment, is there not a danger of injustice being done in dealing with the two classes? I am afraid that is an important omission from the statement. We should have, of course, to give sixpence in every case, and a proper check on the number under Sub-section (*b*) would be only to pass men into that section who are efficient. I believe the proper way to keep it within limits is by raising the standard and paying the reserve properly.

CAPTAIN SINCLAIR asked whether this Bill did not involve the placing of an increased charge upon the expenditure of the country.

MR. WYNDHAM: No, I do not think that follows at all. That is a question that will be debated when the Estimates come on. It depends on the policy of the Government of the day—whether they wish to have many or few.

MR. WARNER said he presumed that the 4d. men were to have 6d., and that would mean an increase on the cost of the Reserve, unless they reduced the total number. He did not suppose that this or any Government was likely to reduce the number of the Reserve. He thought the country was ready to meet the small increased expenditure on the Reserve, looking to the magnificent way they succeeded in filling up the regiments.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed for To-morrow.

POST OFFICE SITES (RE-COMMITTED) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. GRANT LAWSON (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) in the Chair.]

Clause 1:—

Question again proposed, "That Clause 1 stand part of the Bill."

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid) said there were two points in the clause to which he wished to refer. The first was with regard to Sub-section (*a*). When the Secretary of the Treasury looked at the reasonableness of the proposal he had to submit he did not think the right hon. Gentleman would consider there was any ground whatever for making an exception in the case of the Post Office. The Land Clauses Act very properly prescribed that where an undertaking would change the character of the land, the same land tax and poor-rate as before should be paid from the time of demolition until the property could be rated again in the ordinary way, and he saw no reason for exempting the Post Office from the operation of this principle. That was a reasonable position, and he hoped it would commend itself to the Secretary of the Treasury. Of course they could not take it out of the clause at the present moment, but the right hon. Gentleman might gfve them an assurance that the point would be considered in another place. With regard to the sub-section which provided that claims for compensation by tenants from year to year or by leaseholders having unexpired terms of not more than eighteen months to run should be determined under Section 121 of the Land Clauses Act, 1845, he pointed out that that section only referred to those holding from year to year, and he wished to know why it had been thus extended.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. HANBURY, Preston): The hon. Member has perfectly correctly stated the law under the Land Clauses Act. The law is that in the case of demolition of buildings the same land tax and the same poor-rate are to be paid as were paid before the demolition took place, and should continue to be paid until the new buildings are erected. But the land tax is paid to the Government, and it is absurd to say that the Government should pay the land tax to itself. There is no necessity to pay that tax at all. As to the poor-rate, I agree that the Government ought to go on paying the same poor-rate, but, at any rate, in theory, the Government is not liable to pay rates at all, and the words of which the hon. Member complains are simply inserted to protect that right of the Crown. That having been done, I agree that the practice of paying on the same basis as other ratepayers should be adopted, and I will undertake to see that the principle is adopted in this case. The object of introducing leaseholders with not more than eighteen months to run into the other sub-section is to save legal expenses. The Government consider that a leaseholder with no greater interest than that is practically in the same position as a yearly tenant.

MR. WARNER said the principle had now been conceded that the Government were to pay rates like other people.

MR. HANBURY: The hon. Member is entirely mistaken. We do not pay rates the same as other people. The Government has its own valuer, and if we were to strike out the words regarding the poor rate in this case we should depart from our universal rule of having our own valuer.

MR. WARNER said it was not a serious thing whether the valuer was paid by the Government or the district. He thought his hon. friend was justified in raising this question.

MR. JONATHAN SAMUEL (Stockton) said the reply of the Secretary of the Treasury was rather inconsistent, for this reason. He said in reference to the land tax that it was a case of the Government paying the tax to the Government, but in this case it was not so. This Bill was promoted by the Postmaster General. The Post Office was a remunerative Department of the State, and the Post Office if called upon to pay taxes at all should pay like other business concerns the taxes due upon the property it owned. If the Post Office were run by a private company they would be liable for this tax. Therefore he thought the argument of the right hon. Gentleman was very illogical. He believed that the right hon. Gentleman argued in a different sense some time ago. If a corporation owned gas or water works the rates upon the undertaking were paid over to the corporation. It should be the same with a Government Department making about £4,000,000 or £5,000,000 a year. It was unfair that they should demolish buildings in any locality, and that they should for the time being withdraw from the locality the rates which would have been payable on the buildings demolished. He thought the Government got off very cheaply indeed with reference to rates. He held in his hand the last Return issued to the House by the right hon. Gentleman. Anyone reading the Return and knowing the buildings in the different towns would see that the buildings were rated far below their value, and did not contribute to the local rates what they ought to pay. He thought, therefore, that the right hon. Gentleman ought to give a pledge that he would consider this subject with the view of having the law changed, so that this State Department, like any other Department, private individual, or company in the country should be held responsible for the rates and taxes it was entitled to pay.

MR. RECKITT (Lincolnshire, Brigg): It may interest the House in connection with this subject to know upon what basis the valuer for the Post Office assesses the value for rating purposes, because there are a variety of different rules of assessment throughout the country, so that what is a perfectly fair assessment in one locality may be a very unfair one in another. If you have a hard and fast system you may have a post office in one county properly rated by the contribution paid by the Department to the local authority, while in the very next county you may find that the assessment put on by the Government officials is ridiculously disproportionate to the general assessment of other property in the same place. I think the time has come when the Post Office should allow the assessments to be made by the locality, and if the Government still maintain the position that they are not compelled to pay rates, but are willing to make a grant in lieu of rates, that grant should approximate to the assessment made by the local assessment committee. If that were done a great deal of friction and ill-feeling would be removed.

MR. CALDWELL was surprised that the Secretary to the Treasury had not given a more favourable answer. This was not a question of the local or the Government valuators; the amount was fixed by the statute and not by the valuator at all. The question of valuation did not enter into the matter; it was simply a question of justice to the poor rate authority. The object of the law was to protect everybody whose interest was affected, and the poor rate interest was here undoubtedly affected. It was astonishing that the Secretary to the Treasury did not see the difference between the question of the rating of Government property generally, and this question of protecting the interest of the poor rate. Nothing could be more reasonable than that a Government Department should in this respect be put in the same position as any other undertaking, but here Government property was to be treated quite differently.

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 159 ; Noes, 119. (Division List No. 225.)

AYES.

Aird, John	Balcarres, Lord	Blundell, Colonel Henry
Allsopp, Hon. George	Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r	Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Anson, Sir William Reynell	Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds	Brassey, Albert
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.	Banbury, Frederick George	Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Arrol, Sir William	Bartley, George C. T.	Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John	Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol	Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Baird, John Geo. Alexander	Beckett, Ernest William	Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire

Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Hertford, East)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J (Birm.)
Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Coddington, Sir William
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cooke, C. W. Radcliffe (Heref'd)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasg'w)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Cruddas, William Donaldson
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Curzon, Viscount
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred. D.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph D.
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hn. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Man'r
Field, Admiral (Eastbourne)
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Rbt. Penrose-
FitzWygram, General Sir F.
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Fry, Lewis
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Gibbons, J. Lloyd
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Goldsworthy, Major-General
Gordon, Hon. John Edward
Goschen, George J. (Sussex)
Graham, Henry Robert
Green, W. D. (Wednesbury)
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Gull, Sir Cameron
Gunter, Colonel
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Helder, Augustus
Hoare, Sir Samuel (Norwich)
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houldsworth, Sir William H.
Howell, William Tudor
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hutton, John (Yorks. N.R.)
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Lawrence, Sir E. Durning-(Corn
Lecky, Rt. Hon. Wm. E. H.
Leighton, Stanley
Llewelyn, Sir Dillwyn-(Sw'ns'a
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowles, John
Macartney, W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Iver, Sir L. (Edinburgh, W.
M'Killop, James
Manners, Lord Edward Wm. J.
Marks, Henry Hananel
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore, John T.
Milward, Colonel Victor
Monk, Charles James
More, R. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, Hn. Fred (Monm'thsh.
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)
Murray, Chas. J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, H. Pike (Darlington)
Phillpotts, Captain Arthur
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Ridley, Rt. Hon. Sir M. W.
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. C. Thomson
Robinson, Brooke
Round, James
Russell, Gen. F. S. (Cheltenham
Russell, T. W. (Tyrone)
Rutherford, John
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Scoble, Sir Andrew Richard
Seely, Charles Hilton
Seton-Karr, Henry
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew
Sidebotham, J. W. (Cheshire)
Sidebottom, Wm. (Derbysh.)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Jas. Parker (Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spencer, Ernest
Stanley, Hon. A. (Ormskirk)
Stanley, Edward J. (Somerset)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Wm. Edward M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E. (Taunton
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-under-L.
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Joseph Powell-(Birm
Wilson-Todd, W. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, George
Wyvill, Marmaduke D'Arcy
Young Commander (Berks, E.)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert H.
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bainbridge, Emerson
Baker, Sir John
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Augustine
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Cameron, Robert (Durham)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Clark, Dr. G. B.
Colville, John
Commins, Andrew
Crean, Eugene
Crombie, John William
Curran, Thomas (Sligo, S.)
Daly James
Dalziel, James Henry
Doogan, P. C.
Duckworth, James
Dunn, Sir William
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan
Evans, Sir Francis H. (South'ton
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fox, Dr. Joseph Francis
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbt. John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gourley, Sir Edw. Temperley
Grey, Sir Edward (Berwick)
Gurdon, Sir William Brampton
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
Hazell, Walter
Hedderwick, Thomas C. H.
Hemphill, Rt. Hn. Charles H.
Holland, William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jacoby, Alfred James
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
Kay-Shuttleworth Rt Hn Sir U.
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Langley, Batty
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cum'bl'nd
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Macaleese, Daniel
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
M'Ewan, William
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin
M'Leod, John
Maddison, Fred.
Mather, William
Mendl, Sigismund Ferdinand
Montagu, Sir S. (Whitechapel)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Moulton, John Fletcher
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
Oldroyd, Mark
Palmer, Sir C. M. (Durham)
Palmer, George W. (Reading)
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.

Pease, Joseph A. (Northumb.)	Shee, James John	Wallace, Robert
Perks, Robert William	Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire)	Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Philipps, John Wynford	Soames, Arthur Wellesley	Warner, Thomas Courtenay T
Pickard, Benjamin	Souttar, Robinson	Wedderburn, Sir William
Pilkington, Sir G. A. (Lancs. SW	Spicer, Albert	Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Power, Patrick Joseph	Stanhope, Hon. Philip J.	Wilson, John (Govan)
Price, Robert John	Stevenson, Francis S.	Woodhouse, Sir J. T. (H'ddersfd
Provand, Andrew Dryburgh	Strachey, Edward	Woods, Samuel
Reckitt, Harold James	Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)	Young, Samuel (Cavan, E.)
Reid, Sir Robert Threshie	Sullivan, T. D. (Donegal, W.)	Yoxall, James Henry
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)	Tanner, Charles Kearns	
Scott, Charles Prestwich (Leigh	Tennant, Harold John	TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)	Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr	Mr. Caldwell and Mr.
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)	Ure, Alexander	Jonathan Samuel.

MR. CALDWELL pointed out that though this was nominally a Government measure, it was really a private Bill. It was, therefore, necessary that the plans and books of reference should be put in the Tea-room or elsewhere in such a way that those interested in the various constituencies affected might have an opportunity of seeing the plans, and knowing exactly what were the proposed alterations. In this particular case, a number of rights-of-way were to be closed. but it was a very peculiar thing that, so far as the Corporation of London was concerned, great care was taken that no rights-of-way should be shut up there. He wished for an assurance that in future, when the House was practically considering Bills of this character in Committee, the plans should be placed in the Tea-room, so that any Member in whose constituency the proposed compulsory powers were to be granted might have an opportunity of seeing whether local interests were affected by the Bill.

MR. HANBURY pointed out that this was practically an unopposed Bill, and Members had had an opportunity of seeing the plans and books of reference which did not occur in the case of ordinary unopposed Bills.

MR. CALDWELL asked why the Committee should be dealing with the Bill clause by clause and line by line if it had been dealt with upstairs. The position was altogether different from that of a Committee on an unopposed private Bill. If the form was to be kept up of making the House responsible for the wording of the Bill by passing the measure through the House sitting as a Committee, Members ought to have the materials for carrying out their duty properly. He, therefore, thought the assurance for which he had asked ought to be given.

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs): I think there is something to be said for the demand of my hon. friend. At any rate, I rise to ask the right hon. Gentleman to give an assurance of some sort that local opinion will be consulted in the future when land is to be taken for Post Office purposes. In my own constituency land has been purchased, but no heed whatever has been paid to local opinion. A position has been selected which, in my judgment and in the judgment of the mercantile community, is altogether a wrong one. Instead of being in the centre of the town it is some distance away, and no notice whatever was taken of the representations of the most representative bodies in the constituency. The plan suggested by my hon. friend is a most reasonable one, and for the life of me I cannot understand why the assurance asked for should be refused. The right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill is always ready to meet representatives, hear their views, and as far as possible to consult them, but unfortunately the right hon. Gentleman is not the supreme authority in connection with the matter. I wish he were, as probably then there would not be so much opposition to these matters. I think we are entitled to have the assurance that where lands are to be bought the greatest possible care should be taken to consult local opinion, and that the opportunity should be given for Members interested to see exactly what is intended to be done with regard to post offices in their constituencies.

MR. HANBURY said that no doubt in the case of a Bill such as that under consideration where the purchase was one of property by the Government it was a little different from that of an ordinary Railway Bill. He would therefore consult those who advised him in these matters and see whether there would be any objection to allowing the plans in future to be placed

in the Tea-room. He could not himself see why there should be any great objection, and if possible it should be done.

MR. JOHN BURNS: The right hon. Gentleman has consented to do what two or three years ago the Chief Commissioner of Works promised to do in relation to other Government buildings. I wish to support the remarks of the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy by giving an illustration. Three or four years ago I made representations to the Chief Commissioner of Works that wherever a post office was to be erected, the local authority should be consulted, not only as to the site, but upon all matters relating to the position of public buildings in relation to other buildings in the town. For instance, it sometimes happens that the Postmaster General is advised that a post office should project eight or ten feet beyond the line of frontage of adjacent buildings, and the local authorities very properly resent that. Government buildings ought to comply with the local authority's regulations as to line of frontage, sewage, drainage, and sanitation. If the right hon. Gentleman will consult the First Commissioner of Works, he will find that three years ago he promised that whenever a post office was to be erected in London, before the site was finally determined upon the line of frontage should be submitted to the local Building Act authority, and that their regulations should be complied with. I would respectfully suggest that the right hon. Gentleman should carry out that promise of three years ago. In the clause under discussion, as in Clauses 6 and 7, the City Corporation is selected for special reference, and to that particular body extraordinary deference is shown. I would advise the right hon. Gentleman to cut out the references to any particular city, and say that whenever a post office is built the local regulations should be complied with. If he makes a general reference of that kind he will get his Bills through much more easily, because he will then not have Member after Member for towns specially mentioned getting up and making speeches, and other Members who are excluded protesting against these special references.

MR. WARNER: I hope the right hon. Gentleman will really carry out the half-promise he has made to bring the plans into some place where we can see them, and also arrange that we shall be able to see them in sufficient time. The great difficulty is that plans are very often not deposited in time for people to realise that great injustice is being done to a locality. There have been two or three instances in my own constituency where the post office has not given complete satisfaction in regard to site, etc., and where, if the plans had been deposited in time, a satisfactory arrangement might have been arrived at.

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 3 and 4 agreed to.

Clause 5 :—

MR. CALDWELL pointed out that in regard to this clause there was another difficulty connected with the want of plans. The policy of Parliament had been that when powers were granted to any undertaker to pull down dwellings beyond a certain number the occupants should be rehoused. Owing to want of plans, however, it could not be seen what the effect of the proposals of the Post Office would be on the dwellings of the working classes.

MR. HANBURY said the objection of the hon. Member had been met to a certain extent by the promise to look into the matter of the laying of plans. He did not think, however, that any houses would be taken under the Bill which, in the case of an ordinary private Bill, would have come within the operation of the clause to which the hon. Member had referred.

MR. CALDWELL thought the reply of the Secretary to the Treasury was a very general answer indeed. It really amounted to saying that the right hon. Gentleman did not know anything about it, and the Committee were asked to pass the Bill without any of the information to which they were entitled. He would suggest that some slight Amendment should be made in the Bill, in order to necessitate a Report stage, and before that stage was taken the necessary information could be given. It was evident, however, that the Govern-

ment intended to carry the Bill without amendment, but they could not expect to get it through as easily as they would do if they were perfectly frank in the matter. Why should not a paying concern like the Post Office pay in a business-like way, instead of seeking to escape the ordinary liabilities that Parliament imposed upon everybody to whom compulsory powers were granted?

MR. HANBURY thought the hon. Member was wrong in not accepting his statement with regard to the number of houses to be pulled down, but he would undertake to have the matter again looked into, and the fullest information should be given on the Third Reading. If there were cases which in a private Bill would come within the operation of the clause referred to, he would undertake that that clause should be made to operate in regard to this Bill.

MR. STRACHEY (Somersetshire, S) said that the effect of this clause taken with Clause 1 would be that in some districts the assessable value of the district would be reduced. The Post Office might pull down buildings valued at £300 or £400 and erect a building which the Government valuator might assess at only £100, with the result that there would be a decided loss to the local authority. This clause again proved how unfair it was that a local authority should not be allowed to assess these buildings on the same basis as other property in the district.

MR. HANBURY pointed out that the hon. Member seemed to assume that the property to be erected by the Government would be of less value than that to be demolished, whereas really the buildings to be erected would be much more valuable. It was quite possible to say the buildings would not be assessed at the same rate, because as a matter of fact the Government were exempt from rates altogether. The hon. Member should however recollect that, at any rate, within the last few years, the Treasury had seen to it that the valuation made by the Government valuer should be at least equal to that made by the local authority, and he challenged any hon. Member to point to a single case in which there had been any complaint in that respect from the local assessment committee.

MR. JONATHAN SAMUEL expressed his willingness to respond to the challenge of the right hon. Gentleman. In Stockton-on-Tees the post office, customs house, Inland Revenue house, county court, telephone wires, and other items were all rated at the small amount of £470. If they were assessed by the local valuer the amount would be much higher, and he believed the post office alone would be assessed at over £400. When the right hon. Gentleman asserted that Government property was assessed at the same value as other property was assessed at by the local authorities, if he would look through his own Return he would see that that was not the case.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 6:—

MR. CALDWELL said that in this clause there was a general proviso that the Postmaster General might divert, alter, and stop up any street, roadway, or passage within the limits of any of the lands shown on the plans. In the case of this Bill they were dealing with two comparatively poor districts in London, and they were dealing with public rights. Sub-section 2 of Clause 6 provided—

"Nevertheless, nothing in this Act shall authorise the Postmaster General to stop up or close the public passage or footway between Lombard Street and King William Street, known as Post Office Court, in the City of London."

He was not complaining of that, but it showed the different way in which London was treated as compared with other parts of the kingdom. He wanted to know exactly the effect of closing up that passage, because they had not the plans before them. Not having those plans they could not allow a passage to be closed without knowing exactly how and in what respect the public interests would be affected.

MR. HANBURY: The hon. Member must know very well that this passage could not be closed without the assent of the public authority, and that assent would not be given if it was against the public interest. The public authorities have had the fullest opportunity of seeing the plans and of knowing everything that was to be done. They had the power of presenting petitions against the Bill, but

no such petitions have been presented, and no opposition whatever has been raised on the part of the local authorities. Therefore I think it is very strange that the hon. Member should repeat, on clause after clause, his want of confidence in the local authorities. The local authorities must know the circumstances of the locality better than anyone else, and they have had the fullest opportunity of seeing the plans. They have had the fullest information possible. The only real basis for any complaint which the hon. Member makes is apparently the sub-section which provides :—

"Nothing in this Act shall authorise the Postmaster General to stop up or close the public passage or footway between Lombard Street and King William Street."

That is a very important passage, which the Post Office would never have thought of closing up, and therefore they have no objection whatever to this proviso.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 7 :—

*Mr. MOULTON (Cornwall, Launceston) : With regard to this clause I notice that both Clauses 7 and 8 are clauses very general in form. They have no particular application to this Bill, but they are special protective clauses which relate to the Corporation of the City of London, and to it only. Are these special protective clauses put into this Bill by reason of action by the Corporation of London during the pendency of this Bill, or is there any understanding between the Government and the Corporation that in the case of Post Office Bills these protective clauses shall be put in? It seems to me most important that this House should know what are the reasons why the Corporation of the City of London is treated differently to the other great corporations.

Mr. HANBURY : So far as I know the only reason for putting in this clause with regard to the City of London is that it has been the practice for a great number of years to put it in. I am quite ready to admit that I do not think there ought to be any distinction drawn between the Corporation of London and other corporations. I will consult the solicitor to the Post Office on this subject, and I shall be perfectly willing to have amendments introduced in another place to put the other corporations affected by this Bill in exactly the same position as the Corporation of the City of London.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 8 agreed to.

Clause 9 :—

Mr. CALDWELL said that a period of three years for the compulsory purchase of lands was a rather long period, and he wished to know why it was necessary.

Mr. HANBURY : I cannot admit that three years is a long period. I should have thought the argument would have been rather to extend the time.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 10 :—

Mr. CALDWELL said it seemed very strange that they should ask for a special exemption only in the case of one particular district in London. He thought the onus was upon the Secretary to the Treasury to justify this exemption. In the case of Whitechapel it was densely populated, and if they took more ground than they required an open space might be made in that overcrowded district. He did not see why, if they were going to put a post office up in a place of that kind, they should have any special exemption.

Mr. HANBURY : The hon. Member can hardly be aware of what is the ordinary practice in Railway Bills. In Railway Bills a clause to this effect is inserted, but the difference between a Government Bill and Railway Bills is that when the clause is inserted in Railway Bills it applies generally to all the purchases made. They do not pick out one particular property, but they carry a sweeping exemption over the whole properties purchased by them. The Government have not done that in this Bill, but they have reserved this clause for one piece of land only. With regard to other purchases, we are perfectly willing to leave our case within the four corners of the Act. This

Whitechapel case has nothing to do with the City Corporation. The property we require has upon it a house with a large timber yard at the back. We do not want to buy the whole of this property, and it is under those circumstances that this clause has been inserted in the Bill. Of course the case has to be referred to a jury, and if the jury decide that we have to buy the whole of it we shall have to buy it.

MR. CALDWELL said the reply which had been given only showed the necessity for making the inquiry, because they had not had the plans and consequently knew nothing about this land. They knew that as regarded Railway Bills that general proviso was put in, and if it had been put in this Bill in a general way perhaps it would not have needed any explanation. But when the Government applied it only to Saint Mary, Whitechapel, they were entitled to have an explanation.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 11 :—

MR. CALDWELL said that in this case the Government had taken land for the post office, and the clause contained a proviso which would prevent them disposing of the land except by the permission of the railway company. In case of disagreement as to price it was to be settled by arbitration. Why was it necessary to bring in the Arbitration Act of 1889 to settle the compensation to be given? Why could this matter not be taken under the Lands Clauses Act? He thought some little explanation was necessary, for there might be a special reason. The mode of settlement was rather different. He believed that under the Arbitration Act of 1889 the arbitration was done by one arbitrator, whereas under the Lands Clauses Act there would be two arbitrators.

MR. HANBURY: The hon. Member must recollect that, after all, we are acting in friendly concert with the London and South Western Railway Company in this matter. The method provided by the Arbitration Act of 1889 is the mode of arbitration which they prefer, and really there is very little difference between the two. This is the mode which the railway company prefer, and the Post Office is willing to agree to it. After all, I think the two parties concerned are the best judges of what the mode of arbitration ought to be.

MR. CALDWELL said his idea was to make the Bill symmetrical, although his proposal did not substantially alter the clause in any way.

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 12, 13, 14, and 15 agreed to.

Bill reported, with Amendment; to be read the third time To-morrow.

COUNTY COURTS (INVESTMENT OF DEPOSITS) BILL [Lords].

Considered in Committee, and reported; as amended, to be considered To-morrow.

LUNACY BOARD (SCOTLAND) (SALARIES, ETC.) BILL.

Considered in Committee, and reported; as amended, to be considered To-morrow.

OIL IN TOBACCO BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

MR. CALDWELL thought the Chancellor of the Exchequer ought to give some explanation of this measure

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): The reason for the introduction of this Bill is to limit the quantity of oil used in the manufacture of tobacco, there being at present no prohibition as to the quantity of oil that may be used. It has been found that some manufacturers put too much oil into their tobacco, with the result that the public who consume it are injured and the revenue is defrauded. Not only this, but it is very unfair competition.

Question proposed.

Bill read a second time, and committed for To-morrow.

INEBRIATES AMENDMENT (SCOTLAND) BILL [Lords].

Order read for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment to Question [21st June], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

And which Amendment was—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Question again proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Main Question put, and agreed to. Bill read a second time, and committed for To-morrow.

SUPPLY [17TH JULY].

Resolutions reported:—

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1900–1901 (including Supplementary Estimate).

1. Sec. 3. "That a sum, not exceeding £6,739,000 (including an additional sum of £410,000), be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Expense of the Contract Work for Shipbuilding, Repairs, etc., which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901."

2. Sec. 2. "That a sum, not exceeding £4,109,100 (including an additional sum of £55,100), be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Expense of the Material for Shipbuilding, Repairs, Maintenance, etc., including the cost of Establishments of Dockyards and Naval Yards at Home and Abroad, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901."

3. Sec. 1. "That a sum, not exceeding £2,523,000 (including an additional sum of £11,000), be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Expense of the Personnel for Shipbuilding, Repairs, Maintenance, etc., including the cost of Establishments of Dockyards and Naval Yards at Home and Abroad, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901.

4. "That an additional sum, not exceeding £793,200, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for additional Expenditure on the following Navy Services, viz.:—

	£
Vote 9. Naval Armaments .	753,200
Vote 10. Works, Buildings, and Repairs at Home and Abroad	40,000
Total . . .	£793,200"

5. "That a sum, not exceeding £267,100, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Expenses of the Admiralty Office, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901."

Resolutions read a second time.

First Resolution agreed to.

Second Resolution:—

Motion made, and Question put, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

The House divided:—Ayes, 180; Noes, 32. (Division List No. 226.)

AYES.

Aird, John
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arrol, Sir William
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert H.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Baird, John Geo. Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Barlow, John Emmott
Beach, Rt Hon Sir M. H. (Bristol
Beckett, Ernest William
Billson, Alfred
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Brassey, Albert
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brown, Alexander H.
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burt, Thomas
Butcher, John George
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert (Durham)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbys.
Cecil, Evelyn (Hertford, E.)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r
Chaplain, Rt. Hon. Henry
Coddington, Sir William
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colville, John
Cooke, C. W. Radcliffe (Heref'd)
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cruddas, William Donaldson
Curzon, Viscount
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William T.

Duckworth, James
Dunn, Sir William
Emmott, Alfred
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.
Fenwick, Charles
Field, Admiral (Eastbourne)
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitz Wygram, General Sir F.
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Forster, Henry William
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fry, Lewis
Garfit, William
Gibbons, J. Lloyd
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H. (Cy of Lond.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Godson, Sir Augustus Fred.
Goldsworthy, Major-General
Gordon, Hon. John Edward
Goschen, George J. (Sussex)
Graham, Henry Robert
Green, Walford D. (Wednesb'y
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Grey, Sir Edward (Berwick)
Gull, Sir Cameron
Gunter, Colonel
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robert W.
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hazell, Walter
Hoare, Sir Samuel (Norwich)
Holland, William Henry
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Howell, William Tudor
Hozier, Hon. James Henry C.
Hutton, John (Yorks., N.R.)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
Knowles, Lees
Lawrence, Sir E Durning-(Corn.
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cumb l'd
Leighton, Stanley
Llewelyn, Sir Dillwyn-(Swans.)
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowles, John
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macartney, W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Ewan, William
M'Killop, James
Mendl, Sigismund Ferdinand
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore, Jn. Throgmorton
Milward, Colonel Victor
Monk, Charles James
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, Hn F. (Monmouthsh.
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wynd. (Bath)
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Oldroyd, Mark
Palmer, George Wm. (Reading)
Pease, Herbert P. (Darlington
Pease, Joseph A. (Northumb)
Phillpotts, Captain Arthur
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Sir G. A. (Lancs SW
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Ridley, Rt. Hon. Sir M. W.
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. T.
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robinson, Brooke
Round, James
Russell, T. W. (Tyrone)
Samuel, J. (Stockton-on-Tees)
Scoble, Sir Andrew Richard
Seton-Karr, Henry
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)
Sidebotham, J. W. (Cheshire)
Sidebottom, Wm. (Derbyshire)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spencer, Ernest
Spicer, Albert
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strauss, Arthur
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Tennant, Harold John
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, William Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E. (Kent)
Welby, Lt.-Col A C E (Taunton)
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-under-L.
Williams, Joseph Powell-(Birm
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd
Wylie, Alexander
Wyvill, Marmaduke D'Arcy
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Sir William Walrond and
Mr. Anstruther.

NOES

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Burns, John
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Clark, Dr. G. B.
Commins, Andrew
Crean, Eugene
Curran, Thomas (Sligo, S.)
Daly, James
Dalziel, James Henry
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Flynn, James Christopher
Kearley, Hudson E.
Langley, Batty
Macaleese, Daniel
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
M'Ghee, Richard
M'Leod, John
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Pickard, Benjamin
Price, Robert John
Reckitt, Harold James
Shee, James John
Stanhope, Hon. Philip J.
Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)
Sullivan, T. D. (Donegal, W.)
Tanner, Charles Kearns
Thomas, David Alfred (Merth'r
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Dillon and Mr. Flavin.

Third Resolution agreed to.

Fourth Resolution:—

Motion made, and Question put, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

The House divided:—Ayes, 182; Noes, 25. (Division List No. 227.)

AYES.

Aird, John
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Barlow, John Emmott
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol
Beckett, Ernest William
Billson, Alfred
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Brassey, Albert
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John

Brown, Alexander H.
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burt, Thomas
Butcher, John George
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (D'rbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Hertford, East)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.)
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Coddington, Sir William
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Cooke, C. W. Radcliffe (Hereford
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cruddas, William Donaldson
Curzon, Viscount
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duckworth, James
Dunn, Sir William
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fenwick, Charles
Field, Admiral (Eastbourne)
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitz Wygram, General Sir F.
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Forster, Henry William
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fry, Lewis
Garfit, William
Gibbons, J. Lloyd
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H. (City of Lond
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Godson, Sir Augustus F.
Goldsworthy, Major-General
Gordon, Hon. John Edward
Goschen, George J. (Sussex)
Graham, Henry Robert
Green, W. D. (Wednesbury)
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Grey, Sir Edward (Berwick)
Gull, Sir Cameron
Gunter, Colonel
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hayne, Rt. Hn. Charles Seale-
Hazell, Walter
Hoare, Sir Samuel (Norwich)
Holland, William Henry
Houldsworth, Sir William H.
Howell, William Tudor
Hozier, Hon. J. Henry Cecil
Hutton, John (Yorks, N. R.)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
Kearley, Hudson E.
Knowles, Lees
Langley, Batty
Lawrence, Sir E. Durning-(Corn
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks.
Leighton, Stanley
Lewis, John Herbert
Llewelyn, Sir Dillwyn- (Swan.)
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowles, John
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macartney, W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Ewan, William
M'Killop, James
M'Leod, John
Mendl, Sigismund Ferdinand
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore, J. Throgmorton
Milward, Colonel Victor
Monk, Charles James
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, Hn Fred. (Monm'thsh.
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Oldroyd, Mark
Palmer, George W. (Reading)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Pease, Joseph A. (Northumb.)
Phillpotts, Captain Arthur
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Sir G. A. (Lancs, SW
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Price, Robert John
Provand, Andrew Dryburgh
Purvis, Robert
Rankin, Sir James
Reckitt, Harold James
Ridley, Rt. Hn. Sir Matthew W.
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Robinson, Brooke
Round, James
Russell, T. W. (Tyrone)
Samuel, J. (Stockton-on-Tees
Scoble, Sir Andrew Richard
Seton-Karr, Henry
Shaw-Stewart, M. H (Renfrew)
Sidebotham, J. W. (Cheshire)
Sidebottom, William (Derbysh.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Capt. Jno. (Forfarsh.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spencer, Ernest
Spicer, Albert
Stanhope, Hon. Philip J.
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stewart, Sir Mark J. McT
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strachey, Edward
Strauss, Arthur
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Warde, Lt.-Col. C. E. (Kent)
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E (Taunton
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-under-L.
Williams, Joseph Powell-(Birm
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt Hon E. R. (Bath
Woodhouse, Sir J. T. (Huddrsfld
Wylie, Alexander
Wyvill, Marmaduke D'Arcy
Young, Commander (Berks, E.
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Sir William Walrond and
Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Burns, John
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Clark, Dr. G. B.
Commins, Andrew
Crean, Eugene
Curran, Thomas (Sligo, S.)
Daly, James
Dillon, John
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Flynn, James Christopher
Fox, Dr. Joseph Francis
Lawson, Sir Wilf. (Cumb'land)
Macaleese, Daniel
M'Ghee, Richard
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Pickard, Benjamin
Shee, James John
Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)
Sullivan, T. D. (Donegal, W.)
Tanner, Charles Kearns
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. MacNeill and Mr.
Flavin.

Fifth Resolution :—

Further consideration deferred till to-morrow.

In pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th day of this instant July, Mr. Speaker adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at a quarter after Six of the clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, 19th July, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—

Durham (County of) Electric Power Supply.

Lancashire Electric Power.

Also the Certificate that in the case of the following Bill the further proofs required by the Standing Orders Committee have been given:—

Plymouth, Stonehouse, and Devonport Tramways.

And also the Certificate that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have not been complied with:—

North Metropolitan Electric Power Supply.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

TAUNTON CORPORATION BILL.

Report of Her Majesty's Attorney General received, and ordered to lie on the Table.

LONDON, WALTHAMSTOW, AND EPPING FOREST RAILWAY (ABANDONMENT) BILL.

NORTH METROPOLITAN ELECTRIC POWER SUPPLY BILL.

Examiner's Certificates of non-compliance with the Standing Orders referred to the Standing Orders Committee on Monday next.

MARKET WEIGHTON DRAINAGE AND NAVIGATION BILL.

LONDON AND NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY (WALES) BILL.

Reported with Amendments.

LONDON AND SOUTH WESTERN RAILWAY BILL.

The Queen's consent, and the consent of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales in right of his Duchy of Cornwall, signified, and Bill reported with Amendments.

TAUNTON CORPORATION BILL

COVENTRY CORPORATION BILL.

HASTINGS CORPORATION BILL.

ALEXANDRA PARK BILL.

SOUTHPORT CORPORATION BILL.

Moved, That the Order made on 12th day of March last, "That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after Tuesday the 26th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bills be now read 2^a; agreed to; and Bills read 2^a accordingly.

TAUNTON CORPORATION BILL.

COVENTRY CORPORATION BILL.

HASTINGS CORPORATION BILL.

Committed.

ALEXANDRA PARK BILL.

Committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

SOUTHPORT CORPORATION BILL.

Committed.

SUNDERLAND CORPORATION BILL [H.L.].

Read 3^a, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

GREAT NORTHERN RAILWAY BILL.

MIDLAND RAILWAY BILL.

Read 3^a, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

SOUTH-EASTERN METROPOLITAN TRAMWAYS BILL.

Read 3^a, with the Amendments; further Amendments made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.

PORTLAND URBAN DISTRICT GAS BILL.

Read 3^a, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

GREAT INDIAN PENINSULA RAILWAY COMPANY BILL.

Committed for To-morrow.

BURNLEY CORPORATION BILL [H.L.]

Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to, with an Amendment; and Bill returned to the Commons.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates Revision by the Member.

SOUTH STAFFORDSHIRE TRAMWAYS BILL [H.L.].

FALKIRK AND DISTRICT WATER BILL [H.L.].

Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to.

HAMILTON, MOTHERWELL, AND WISHAW TRAMWAYS BILL.

Commons Amendment considered, and agreed to.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 7) BILL [H.L.].

Returned from the Commons agreed to.

WELLINGBOROUGH AND DISTRICT TRAMROADS BILL.

Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

ASTON MANOR TRAMWAYS BILL [H.L.].

Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to.

GWYRFAI RURAL DISTRICT COUNCIL WATER BILL [H.L.].

Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments.

KINGSCOURT, KEADY, AND ARMAGH RAILWAY BILL.

Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, no parties having appeared in opposition thereto; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. The Orders made on the 26th of June and Monday last discharged; and Bill committed for To-morrow.

CROYDON TRAMWAYS AND IMPROVEMENTS BILL.

Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, the opposition thereto having been withdrawn; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. The Orders made on Thursday and Monday last discharged; and Bill committed.

GREAT NORTHERN RAILWAY (IRELAND) BILL.

Report from the Select Committee That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, no parties having appeared in opposition thereto; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. The Orders made on the 2nd instant and Monday last discharged; and Bill committed.

LONDON (ST. LUKE) PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

LONDON (SOUTHWARK) PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

Moved, That the order made on the 12th day of March last, "That no Provisional Order Confirmation Bill brought before the House of Commons shall be read a second time after Tuesday, the 26th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bills be now read 2^a; agreed to; Bills read 2^a accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the whole House To-morrow.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 3) BILL.

House in Committee (according to Order), Bill reported without amendment; Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3^a To-morrow.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDERS (HOUSING OF WORKING CLASSES) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDERS (HOUSING OF WORKING CLASSES) (No. 2) BILL.

House in Committee (according to Order). Bills reported without amendment; Standing Committee negatived; and Bills to be read 3^a To-morrow.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 10) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 11) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 13) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDER (HOUSING OF WORKING CLASSES) BILL.

Read 3^a (according to Order), and passed.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 1) BILL.

PIER AND HARBOUR PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 2) BILL.

Read 3^a (according to Order), with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

LONDON (CLERKENWELL AND HOLBORN) PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

LONDON (POPLAR) PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

Read 3ª (according to Order), and passed.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 7) BILL.
(Chester Rural Order.)

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 9) BILL.
(Dorchester Order.)

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 14) BILL.
(Torquay Order.)

TRAMWAYS PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 5) BILL.
(Weston-super-Mare Order.)

TOTTENHAM URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL BILL.

BRAY AND ENNISKERRY RAILWAY BILL.

ALEXANDRA PARK BILL.

NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE ELECTRIC SUPPLY BILL.

Report from the Committee of Selection, That the following Lords be proposed to the House to form the Select Committee for the consideration of the said Bills, viz. :—

E. Carrington,
L. Churchill,
L. Stanmore,
L. Rathmore (chairman),
L. Heneage ;

agreed to ; and the said Lords appointed accordingly. The Committee to meet on Tuesday next, at Eleven o'clock ; and all petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Bills to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Bills.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TREATY SERIES, No. 14 (1900).

Treaty of friendship, commerce and navigation between the United Kingdom and the Republic of Honduras ; signed at Guatemala, 21st January, 1887 (ratifications exchanged at Guatemala, 3rd February, 1900) ; together with an explanatory protocol signed at Guatemala 3rd February, 1900.

METROPOLITAN WATER SUPPLY (ROYAL COMMISSION).

Maps, plans, and diagrams to accompany the minutes of evidence and report of Her Majesty's Commissioners appointed to inquire into the subject of the water supply within the limits of the Metropolitan Water Companies.

LOCAL TAXATION (IRELAND).

Return for the year 1898-99.

LAND LAW (IRELAND) ACT, 1887 (EVICTION NOTICES).

Return of the number of eviction notices filed during the quarter ended 30th June, 1900.

QUEEN'S COLLEGE, CORK.

Annual Report of the President, for the session 1899-1900.

IMPERIAL INSTITUTE (INDIAN SECTION).

Annual Report for the year 1899-1900.

GREENWICH OBSERVATORY.

Report of the Astronomer Royal to the Board of Visitors of the Royal Observatory, Greenwich, read at the annual visitation of the Royal Observatory, 26th June, 1900.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

LAND REGISTRY.

Account of receipts and payments in respect of the Land Registry for the year ended 31st March, 1900.

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE AND COURT OF APPEAL.

Account showing the receipts and expenditure in respect of the High Court of Justice and the Court of Appeal during the year ended 31st March, 1900.

COURT OF PROBATE DIVISION (HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE) (IRELAND).

Annual account of receipts and disbursements, for the year ended 31st December, 1899.

SUPERANNUATION.

Treasury Minute, dated 29th June, 1900, granting a retired allowance to Mr. Thomas Alfred Inch, a second division clerk (higher grade) under the

Board of Trade, under Section 2 of the Superannuation Act, 1887.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

HOUSE OF LORDS OFFICES.

Second Report from the Select Committee made; to be printed; and to be considered on Tuesday next. (No. 191.)

COPYRIGHT (ARTISTIC) BILL [H.L.].

Reported from the Select Committee with Amendments, and committed to a Committee of the whole House on Monday next; and to be printed as amended. (No. 192.)

COPYRIGHT BILL [H.L.].

COPYRIGHT (ARTISTIC) BILL [H.L.].

Reported from the Select Committee with the proceedings of the Committee) made, and to be printed (No. 193): Minutes of evidence, together with an appendix, laid upon the Table, and delivered out.

POOR REMOVAL BILL.

[THIRD READING.]

Order of the Day for the Third Reading read.

Bill read 3ª (according to Order).

LORD DAVEY: My Lords, I must apologise for troubling your Lordships with an Amendment to this Bill at this stage. My noble friend Lord Avebury, in Committee of the whole House, moved a clause which had the same object, but which was not substantially in the same words as the Amendment standing in my name on the Paper. That Amendment was, however, rejected. My noble friend was under the impression that he could move it again before the Standing Committee, but the noble Earl who presides over that Committee expressed the opinion that that could not be done. Therefore I ask your Lordships to consider the Amendment which I have put down. The first sub-section of Clause 1 of this Bill is as follows—

"A person who has resided continuously for five years in England shall not thereafter be removed to Ireland under the Acts relating to the relief of the poor."

It has occurred to many of us that that is rather a large order and rather vague in its terms. An Irish labourer may have tramped about the country seeking and finding, or not finding, work, for five years or for a less period, and then he may apply for poor relief in a parish into which, perhaps, he has only come within the previous week. It is unjust to the ratepayers of that parish or union that they should be burdened with the maintenance of the Irish labourer, who really has no connection whatever with the place, merely because he happened to be in a particular parish or union when he applied for relief. I propose, therefore, to insert, after the first sub-section, the words—

"Provided that such person shall have resided continuously for at least six months in the parish or union from which it is proposed to remove him."

That will give a guarantee of some residential connection with the parish or union in which he seeks relief, and it will also follow the precedent in the Scottish Act. Under that Act the pauper cannot avoid removal from Scotland to Ireland unless he has resided for, I believe, a whole year in the place from which it is sought to remove him. I am sure your Lordships will see that the clause, as it stands, may impose a great burden upon the ratepayers of a parish or union with which the pauper has no connection whatever, and I hope the House will agree to my Amendment.

Moved—

"In Clause 1, page 1, line 7, after 'the poor' to insert 'provided that such person shall have resided continuously for at least six months in the parish or union from which it is proposed to remove him.'"—(*Lord Davey.*)

*LORD MORRIS: My Lords, I hope the House will not agree to this Amendment, which would practically render the Bill entirely inoperative and useless. I do not think my noble and learned friend can have studied the history of this question, which has been agitated for the last fifty years. It is thirty-four years since I myself moved in the House of Commons†—

"That the state of the law of removal from England to Ireland of persons receiving poor-law relief is one deserving of the immediate attention of Parliament and of the Government."

† See *The Parliamentary Debates* [Third Series], Vol. clxxxiv., p. 299.

The late Mr. Charles Villiers, who was at that time at the head of the Poor-Law Board, stated that this was "a very old grievance." That was his language thirty-four years ago, and this is the first practical attempt to remedy that grievance. I think I can appeal—in support of my statement that this has always been a subject of great grievance in Ireland—to the noble Earl opposite, Earl Spencer, who had a very long reign in Ireland as Lord Lieutenant. Under the present state of the law an Irish labourer who comes over here as a boy, and who probably spends the whole of his life in this country, may, in his old age, when he is like a squeezed lemon, be sent over and pitched on the coast of Ireland to be taken care of by the first union into which he is placed. It is not a question between one parish and another parish; it is an international question between England and Ireland. There is at present no reciprocity. An Irish pauper who applied for relief in England can be removed to Ireland, but an English-born pauper who applies for relief in Ireland must be kept in Ireland by the union to which he applies. This question between different parishes in England has nothing to do with the Irish grievance. The English parishes must fight it out amongst themselves. If a man who has been absent from Ireland for five years does not form a settlement according to English law in a certain parish, what has that to do with Ireland? Why should he be sent back to Ireland on that account? The promoters of this Bill have drawn a very large limit in saying an Irish person should have resided for five years continuously in England before becoming irremovable. In my opinion that period is too long. I hope the House will not, at the twelfth hour, strangle a Bill which has been long looked forward to in Ireland, and which will remedy what has always created a great deal of annoyance and dissatisfaction.

*LORD AVEBURY: My Lords, the Amendment I moved when the Bill was in Committee was discussed for some little while and withdrawn. It was not rejected. The noble and learned Lord who has just spoken has not dealt with the case of this Amendment. It is not an Irish question. We have agreed that an Irishman who has been five years in England is to be relieved in England, but the question is where. The Bill gives him his choice, the amendment says he is to be relieved where he has worked. Why should an Irishman be placed in a different position in this matter from an Englishman or a Scotsman? If he were a Scotsman or an Englishman he would not obtain a settlement in the way indicated by this Bill. Under this Bill an Irishman, although he may not have lived in the parish or union in which he applies for relief more than a few days, is able to throw himself upon that parish or union for the rest of his life. Surely, if he has been working for some time in one part of England there should be power to remove him to that part of England when he becomes chargeable to the poor law. By this Bill as it stands you are cutting into the root of the whole law of settlement. All that my noble and learned friend asks is that the person shall have been for six months in the parish or union in which he claims relief. Surely that is a very reasonable suggestion. What we fail to see is why, in the case of an Irishman, all the safeguards in the working of the poor law which Parliament has devised in the case of Englishmen and Scotsmen should be dispensed with.

EARL SPENCER: My Lords, I still maintain the view I expressed when Lord Avebury's Amendment was before the House. It is impossible to put the two countries on the same footing, for the very reason that in Ireland there is not a law of settlement and in England there is. An Englishman who happens to be in Ireland and applies for relief has to be relieved by the union in which he applies, and cannot be removed, whereas an Irishman applying for relief in England can be removed back to his own country. Therefore I say, if you are going to remove this difficulty, do it in a liberal spirit. It is only fair that, as an Englishman cannot be removed from Ireland, an Irishman should be placed in a similar position when in this country.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: This Bill does not give reciprocity. It says an Irishman must have resided five years in England before becoming irremovable. Reciprocity would be to put an Irishman in the same position in England as an Englishman occupies in Ireland. It

would be reciprocity if an Irishman in England was entitled to obtain relief in any parish or union where he might apply for it and be irremovable. I certainly do feel as strongly as the noble and learned Lord opposite that this has been a real and substantial grievance in Ireland. The question is whether, in removing this grievance conditionally upon a residence of five years, it is desirable that you should place upon the parishes in which Irishmen apply for relief, and in which they may only have been residing for a few days, the burden of perpetually maintaining them.

LORD HARRIS: I was under the impression that the noble Earl the Leader of the Opposition spoke on the Second Reading, and that he was a supporter of the measure.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: I made exactly the same remarks on the Second Reading.

LORD HARRIS: I do not contest, as I said in Committee, the fact that England will suffer under this Bill. The measure was introduced with the idea of removing from Ireland some of the injustice she has long laboured under, and I do not deny that the burden has fallen upon England. I may remind your Lordships that this Amendment was negatived in Committee after a long discussion.

LORD AVEBURY: I beg my noble friend's pardon. It was withdrawn.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR OF IRELAND (Lord ASHBOURNE): Yes, after a full discussion.

LORD HARRIS: I understood that the noble Lord accepted the arguments as sufficient, and withdrew his Amendment. Technically I was wrong in saying it was negatived, but the noble Lord had an opportunity of going to a division, which he did not avail himself of. The proposal on that occasion was that the pauper should have resided continuously for at least twelve months in the parish or union from which it was proposed to remove him. The noble and learned Lord opposite now proposes a residence of six months. This would really do away altogether with the justice the Government asks you to do to Ireland. It would make removability very much more easy and irremovability very much more difficult. If you are going to do this act of justice to Ireland, I submit that it is better to do it with a good grace. The noble Lord below the gangway (Lord Avebury) argued that it would be hard upon the union of the parish on which the liability of maintaining the pauper would in future rest unless such an Amendment were adopted. I admit that, but all the unions and parishes in England run the risk, which is therefore shared amongst them all. I submit that as the Bill has gone through its various stages in this House, there is no reason for amending it in the way suggested by the noble and learned Lord.

On Question, Amendment negatived.

Bill passed.

DIOCESAN REGISTRATION BILL [H.L.]

Amendments reported (according to Order), and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow.

CHARITABLE LOANS (IRELAND) BILL.

Read 3ª (according to Order), and passed.

MERCHANT SHIPPING (LIABILITY OF SHIPOWNERS AND OTHERS) BILL.

Amendment reported (according to Order), and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow.

MEMBERS OF LOCAL AUTHORITIES RELIEF BILL [H.L.]

Amendments reported (according to Order): A further amendment made: and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow.

COUNTY COURTS (IRELAND) BILL [H.L.]

Read 3ª (according to Order), and passed, and sent to the Commons.

VETERINARY SURGEONS (AMENDMENT) BILL.

Read 3ª (according to Order), and passed.

TITHE RENT-CHARGE (IRELAND) BILL.

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

*LORD ASHBOURNE: My Lords, in asking your Lordships to give a Second Reading to this Bill, I shall occupy as little of the time of the House as possible.

The Bill is brought in to remedy what is a clear grievance, and to do a piece of tardy justice. In Ireland, as in England, tithes were a charge upon the land, and for a very considerable time were paid by the occupier. Until the year 1823 tithes in Ireland were paid in kind by the occupier, but at that time a change was made, and although the occupier was left still the person to pay, the change was made that there should be a money composition. That went on for a considerable time—namely, until the year 1838. Then a further change was made, and for public convenience, which was recognised upon all sides, the landlord was made the person who was to pay. A tithe rent-charge was created, and he was made the person to pay a sum that was measured at three-quarters of the previous money composition. The assumption, I presume, was that he might add, possibly, the amount of the tithe that he was called upon to pay to the rent. That may have been done in some cases, but I do not believe it was at all generally done. I have read statements by those who have studied the question indicating that it was not generally done. In Ireland, as in England, it has at all times been of the very essence of tithe that it should be variable and subject to occasional revision. The statutory machinery provided in Ireland for this purpose was different, fortunately for England, from that in England; the statutory machinery provided in Ireland was that if certain not very simple methods were adopted, the tithe rent-charges might be varied by reference to the average price of wheat and oats that were published from time to time in the *Dublin Gazette*. That method was clumsy and inconvenient, but it worked, as clumsy and inconvenient methods do work, in a kind of way for a long time. But in the year 1889 a change was made in the *Dublin Gazette*—no one has ever been able exactly to trace how the change occurred—and the publication in the *Gazette* of the prices of the two commodities, wheat and oats, ceased.

EARL SPENCER: In what year?

*LORD ASHBOURNE: In the year 1889. I have mentioned no year that touches any particular conscience, and I have said that nobody has ever been able to ascertain why the change was made.

THE EARL OF MAYO: In what year did the noble and learned Lord say the publication of the averages in the *Gazette* ceased?

*LORD ASHBOURNE: In 1889.

THE EARL OF MAYO: I thought it was long before that.

*LORD ASHBOURNE: No. The publication of the averages ceased in 1889, for what reason no one has ever been able to find out, and, strange to say, the cessation of their publication was not ascertained or relied on in our Courts for a considerable time. The matter, however, came before the Courts in Ireland, and it was then contended, with irresistible force, that, as the averages had ceased to be published in the statutory way required, there was nothing that could be appealed to to satisfy the requirements of the Statute. Accordingly, what was an obvious injustice resulted. Up to a comparatively recent time the position of Irish lay and ecclesiastical tithes was exactly the same as to variation; they each had to be varied and revised by reference to the publication of prices in the *Dublin Gazette*. But at the time I am referring to this only applied to lay tithes. It is obvious that the absence of any machinery by which these tithes can be varied and revised is a clear and distinct grievance. This is, indeed, not denied or questioned by any one. The position of ecclesiastical tithes at the present time is somewhat different. They were dealt with in the Irish Church Act of 1869, when it was distinctly stated by Mr. Gladstone—I have his words here, and they have been quoted in the other House during the last three weeks—that the calculation of the then Government was that ecclesiastical tithes should be commuted at the purchase of $22\frac{1}{2}$ years, with an interest not exceeding $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. and an annuity not exceeding 45 years. When the Act came to be examined, however, it was found that the annuity, instead of running from the time stated, was to run for 52 years. How the figure 45, stated by the Prime Minister in his place in Parliament to be the proper figure, became 52 has not hitherto been explained; but it has never been suggested that it can be seriously defended or that it was anything but a most inconceivable blunder.

Moreover, the 3½ per cent. interest pays off every farthing in 45 years, and it is only the simplest justice to get rid of the additional seven years which have in some way been added, and which cannot be defended or even explained on any theory of common sense or ordinary arithmetic. During the discussions—the anxious discussions—which took place in the House of Commons there was no effort on the part of the fitful Opposition interveners in Debate to give any vestige of explanation of this figure, and every one was compelled to admit that every farthing of the tithe was paid off in 45 years. The next step was taken in 1872. At that time, I believe, the Government had under consideration a loan on the security of the Church property—a loan of £9,000,000—and it was deemed desirable by Mr. Gladstone and the able Ministers who composed his Government that there should be a change in reference to tithe rent-charge, and that the power of revision should be taken away. It was considered a more satisfactory security not to have a variable charge, but that there should be a fixed tithe incapable of change. That was regarded as a better asset on which to rely as a security, and also more satisfactory to deal with. Under these circumstances the power of revision was taken away by the Act of 1872. It was a very short Act—a Treasury Act—and one which did not, so far as I can see, excite any attention whatever. It passed through Parliament towards the close of the session without debate, but it has been gravely alleged that the Act of 1872, by which the power of revision was taken away, was a bargain. The habits of my life and of my office require that I should use moderate and temperate language, but I am at a loss to describe in adequate terms this suggestion. It is a grotesque absurdity. Who was the bargain between? What was the bargain about? Why should there be a bargain? There is not a trace of any such suggestion to be found in *Hansard*, and I have spoken to gentlemen who were then members of the House of Commons, and they inform me that they never heard or dreamt of such a thing as this being a bargain. The suggestion is absolutely unsupported by proof, and has really no bearing upon the question. Had the power of revision remained, had it not been taken away by this Act of 1872, the Irish ecclesiastical tithe, like the English tithe, would, I have heard, be payable at a percentage much less than at present. At any rate, wheat has fallen from that time by about 40 per cent., and oats by about 22 per cent., and, as every one knows, there have been enormous reductions in the value of land. Therefore it is simple justice to do what the Bill does. If my statements cannot be contradicted, am I not right in saying that there is a clear grievance to be righted and a palpable injustice to be got rid of? The first of the proposals is to reduce from 52 to 45 years the period provided for the redemption of the annuities, and, secondly to restore the variation and power of revision with regard to both lay and ecclesiastical tithes. In England, where revision exists, there has been, as your Lordships know, a vast reduction in tithes. Irish tithe payers have been deprived of that benefit, and therefore it is simple justice to do what this Bill does. The measure has been described as another dole to Irish landlords, but it is the simplest, the nakedest, and the merest act of justice. If the payment of the tithes had never been handed over to the landowner and were still payable by the occupier, could any human being, with any regard for his own sanity, suggest that every dictate of justice did not require that everything I have suggested should be carried out? This is not a one-sided proceeding at all. It was pointed out in 1885, when the first of the Land Purchase Acts was introduced, that it was not reasonable to ask glebe tenant-purchasers to go on paying their instalments with the inclusion of the original rate of interest, and their friends in both Houses of Parliament said that justice required that there should be a revision. They were given it with universal approval, and the 3½ per cent. interest on their loans was cut down to £3 1s. 8d. No one said then that justice should not be done. Justice required that that should be done then in the interests of tenant-purchasers, and it requires that it should be done now in the interests of the landlords. In Ireland the system has always been cumbrous, inconvenient, expensive, and difficult to carry out. Wheat is not now grown in Ireland to the extent it used to be; and the standards that were formerly appealed to have ceased to be

efficient regulations for the purpose. The plan by which it is proposed to ascertain the amount of variation—namely, by the average judicial reduction of rents in each county, is fair, intelligible, and a thousand times better than resorting to the old methods. Another important feature of the Bill is that it takes away the power of redeeming tithe rent charges, save in the case of sales under the Land Acts, and then it is intended to safeguard the terms. There is another clause in the Bill, dealing with the deduction of Poor Rate from tithe, which the Chief Secretary calculated would assist the Irish Church Fund by a sum of about £6,000 a year. This benefit will be obtained in connection with decisions as to the deductions made from tithes for the Poor Rate. The figures in reference to these matters have been very fully stated in the other House of Parliament, and I have confined myself to presenting the case to your Lordships in the shortest possible way, because I recognise that there are many other topics on your Lordship's Paper for discussion to-night. Of course, I will be quite ready to give any information to the House or to answer any questions that may be put to me at this or any subsequent stage.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Lord Ashbourne.*)

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: My Lords, I certainly feel a certain amount of embarrassment in controverting what has been said by the noble and learned Lord, because he has so pointedly laid it down that every proposition which he has put before the House is absolutely just, absolutely sound, and absolutely impossible of doubt. It may seem somewhat remarkable that I doubt the greater portion of the assertions the noble and learned Lord has made. First of all, I will deal with the very novel argument with which he commenced his speech, and which, I must say, surprised me extremely. It appears that at some stage of the Irish Church Bill, Mr. Gladstone, who was then at the head of the Government, and who, as the noble and learned Lord most justly said, took a special interest in that legislation, said that ecclesiastical tithes should be commuted at the purchase of 22½ years, with an interest not exceeding 3½ per cent., and an annuity not exceeding 45 years. Subsequently it appears that an interest of £4 9s. 0d. per cent. and a period of 52 years were fixed in the Act. On that the noble and learned Lord says there has been a great injustice, and that we should regard the statement made by the Prime Minister of that day in the course of a speech as conclusive. I have never heard such an argument. I always thought Acts of Parliament were conclusive. Mr. Gladstone is not alive to explain the words he used in 1869, but I entirely deny that we are bound by the statement of even so great a man as Mr. Gladstone.

LORD ASHBOURNE: Mr. Gladstone's words are not contradicted by arithmetic.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: But they are contradicted by something which is binding upon us quite as much as arithmetic—namely, an Act of Parliament. According to the noble and learned Lord, it is so perfectly clear that a great injustice was committed, because the Act is not in accordance with some words which he found in a speech of Mr. Gladstone, that we are bound now, after twenty-seven years, to remedy what was then done. If this is so extremely simple, so perfectly evident, so absolutely conclusive, what was the Conservative Government which came into office in 1874 doing? Had they no supporters amongst Irish landlords? The Act then was a very fresh one, and if the injustice had been so wonderfully apparent it would naturally have been for the Government of that day, which had no particular love for Mr. Gladstone's legislation, to remedy it. I dismiss that argument of the noble and learned Lord as having no bearing on the question. The noble and learned Lord said there was no bargain. The case really is that twenty-seven years ago Parliament laid down a certain principle for the payment of tithe, and it seems to me a dangerous doctrine, after Parliament has dealt with the matter so long ago, that we should now set aside that Act. Past legislation may have inflicted hardships on those subjected to it. That argument is one which may always be used. But I am surprised that twenty-seven years should have been allowed to elapse without any attempt to remedy any hardships in the present case. I deny that the Bill is a matter of justice; it is purely a matter of expediency. In

the present state of prices an undue burden has been laid on the landlords of Ireland, and that should be lightened. That is the case of the Government, and I dismiss all other arguments. It comes to this, that after twenty-seven years the Government have made up their minds that they ought to make a present to the Irish landlords of a certain portion of the Irish Church fund. I feel some sympathy for the Irish landlords in the position in which they find themselves, but I must repeat what I have often said, that if the Irish landlords lived in the part of the kingdom in which I do they would not consider themselves so badly off. I object to the Bill on the ground that it is upsetting a deliberate arrangement made by Parliament, and then regarded as just and fair, for the purpose of giving a money advantage to a certain class.

LORD CLONBROCK: My Lords, it is gratifying to those who are interested in the Bill introduced by my noble and learned friend to hear him describe it as a mere measure of justice. It is, indeed, a tardy measure of justice, for relief in this matter has been promised to Irish tithe rent-charge payers for the last twelve years. In support of its being a measure of justice, I should like to compare the position of the English and Irish tithe rent-charge payer since the year 1872. It is somewhat singular, my Lords, that when a comparison can be made, by any stress of imagination, to the detriment of the interests of property in Ireland, such as, for instance, the comparison of the reduction of rents in England and Ireland, it is pressed home, however unsound may be the foundation upon which it rests; but when there is any comparison which would tell the other way, St. George's Channel appears to be an insuperable objection to its being adduced. Indeed, as to all rights of property, it seems to make all the difference in the world on which side of St. George's Channel the property is situated. I was much struck some days ago at hearing the noble Earl the leader of the Opposition condemning a Government measure—the Military Manœuvres Bill—on the ground that it assumed a certain control over a landlord's property for three weeks in the year, for ever. I thought at the time that there was a certain force in the noble Earl's objections, but I could not help contrasting this solicitude for the rights of property with the slight regard paid to those rights by the Land Act of 1881, an Act which deprived Irish landlords of more than 25 per cent. of the fee-simple of their property, not for three weeks, but for all the year round, for ever. I wonder the noble Marquess who had charge of that Bill did not notice the inconsistency, but I suppose that the severe training which he underwent in 1896, before he was reduced, as he then told us, to the position of a tame elephant, has rendered him somewhat callous to the injuries inflicted on his wilder brethren. But a comparison between the English and the Irish tithe rent-charge payer shows that the former in 1872 had to pay £108 16s. 0d. for every £100 tithe rent-charge as fixed in 1836, while in 1899 he only paid £68 2s. 4d. Now by the Act of 1872 tithe rent-charge in Ireland was rendered invariable, and the tithe rent-charge payer has ever since been paying the same amount as in 1872, notwithstanding the fall in prices. It is no wonder, therefore, that the opponents of this measure take very good care not to draw a comparison, which they might be ready enough to do if it told the other way. My Lords, this settlement in 1872 is spoken of as a bargain, which tithe rent-charge payers gladly accepted, fearing that the price of corn might rise. Now, no one probably anticipated the deplorable agricultural depression which has since occurred, but, on the other hand, no one in his senses, seeing the continually increasing facilities for the importation of corn, could have dreaded as a tithe payer, or hoped for as a farmer, any decided rise in the price of corn. Indeed, prices, after some fluctuation, showed a tendency to fall in the years immediately preceding 1872. The fact is that the Act of 1872 was slipped through Parliament in August as a Departmental measure, without any explanation in either House, and escaped observation. But tithe rent-charge payers have suffered in another way by legislation. By the Church Act of 1869 the price of redemption of tithe rent-charge was fixed at 22½ years purchase. A high authority on the subject, Mr. O'Brien, has stated that in previous times it never was worth more than 17. On the other hand, in consequence of the Land Act of 1881, the selling value of property has been reduced from about 22½ years purchase of the old rent to about 17 of the new. Consequently the value of property

has been artificially reduced about 5½ years purchase, and the charge on it artificially raised by the same amount. And yet wonder is expressed that Irish landlords complain of being unjustly treated. It is needless to point out that the Church Fund has benefited by the extravagant price exacted from those who have redeemed, mainly under the Land Purchase Acts. The amount must be over half a million sterling. And now, my Lords, as to the provisions of the Bill itself. While we can only consider it as a measure of justice, and as a partial measure of justice, we must acknowledge that the Government have spared no effort to pass it in the face of a most determined and unscrupulous opposition. But the pity is that when they were prepared to take so much trouble, they did not make it a more comprehensive measure. For I must point out that, while it offers some relief to what I may call the more improvident persons, who did not commute their tithe rent-charge, it offers practically nothing to the more provident who did, for the reduction of the number of years from 52 to 45 is nothing more than the rectification of an arithmetical blunder. It cannot be contended that the Government intended to charge those who commuted £3 16s. 3d. per cent. interest, when the ordinary rate for Government loans was £3 10s. 0d If the interest is taken at £3 10s. 0d., payment of £4 9s. 0d. per cent. for 52 years would mean the payment of £130 for every £100 advanced. We hoped that, in the case of those who had commuted, the Government would have ascertained the capital amount already redeemed, and treated the residue as a loan to be redeemed in the same way, and on the same terms as loans made to tenants. This would have involved no loss to the Treasury. Finally, my Lords, there is the case of lay tithe rent-charge payers, and holders of perpetuities. In their case there is no question of public money. But they have suffered from the failure of duty of some Government official. Their payments were not affected by the Act of 1872, but remained variable in accordance with the average prices of oats and wheat which ought to be published, and up to 1872 always were published, in the *Dublin Gazette*. The rents of perpetuity holders were also variable in accordance with those prices. But soon after 1872 these prices were at first incorrectly published, the mean being taken instead of the average, and since 1887 have not been published at all. Consequently no variation has been possible. The lay tithe rent-charge payers urge that they have an undoubted grievance against Government in this matter. They are by no means satisfied with the scale of variation proposed for them in the Bill, and cannot see why the prices published by the Land Commission should not be adopted in place of those which ought to have been published by the Government. The holders of perpetuities who have just the same grievance are not included in the Bill at all, as might easily have been done. My Lords, we are given to understand that if we attempt to introduce any amendments into this Bill, we shall probably lose it altogether. I do not, therefore, propose to do so. But I think it necessary to point out how much it falls short of what we might have expected, and to protest against the statements which have been made that it is a singular act of beneficence to Irish landlords. Moreover, it is not a measure affecting landlords alone. I may mention that in 1869 there were 36,000 tithe rent-charge payers, while the number of proprietors who could correctly be described as landlords was not more than a third of that total.

*THE EARL OF MAYO: It is a pleasure to see our old friend the Tithe Rent-charge Bill, of which we have heard so much, first of all in two Queen's Speeches and also in a great many debates, brought forward. It is a measure of justice, and I deny the statement of the noble Earl opposite that it is a boon. As usual, we are compared to English landowners. That is the comparison which is always made in this House, but what are the facts of the case? English landowners can have their tithes revised by the prices of corn and oats, but in Ireland there is no revision at all. As my noble friend Lord Cronbrock has gone so fully into the subject there is very little for me to say, except that we accept the Bill not as a boon but as a simple act of justice on the part of the Government. It is really time that the Bill was passed, and I am delighted to see it in this House. A short section was slipped into the Bill in the House of Commons which creates an obvious in-

justice. By that section it is provided that:—

"Sections three and four of this Act shall not apply to any tithe rent-charge payable to the Land Commission out of hereditaments the fee simple of which has, after the tenth day of August one thousand eight hundred and seventy-two and before the twelfth day of May one thousand eight hundred and ninety-nine, been conveyed to a purchaser on a sale."

The argument adduced for the insertion of these words was that when the estate was purchased a certain allowance was made for the tithe rent-charge. But I must draw your Lordships' attention to the fact that the rents on the estate are reducible every 15 years, and it is hardly fair that the man who purchased the estate should go on paying the same tithe rent-charge. I only raise this by way of protest. I know it is no good moving an Amendment; but I hope the noble Marquess who is going to wind up the debate will say something on that point.

THE EARL OF ARRAN: Before my noble friend the Marquess of Londonderry makes his speech, which I am sure will throw a great deal of light on this question, I should like to say a few words. I agree with my noble friends who have spoken from this side of the House that this Bill is an act of tardy justice to the Irish landlords. One of the advantages of the Bill is that the question of revision of tithe rent-charge will be rendered perfectly simple. Under the old Act, to get a tithe revised necessitated the proving of the whole title to the estate. It was a matter of great difficulty. The co-operation of several people had to be obtained as a rule, and the cost was very often a great deal more than the thing was worth. I hail with satisfaction the simplification of the procedure. Having said that, I venture to express my opinion that we owe very little gratitude for this Bill. It is a sort of salve for the policy which has been pursued by the British Government in regard to Ireland for 28 years past, and which I cannot help thinking will inevitably lead to the absolute expropriation of the Irish landlords. I should like to ask, What has this country gained by this policy? Is Ireland more contented or more loyal? I venture to think, speaking for that part of Ireland with which I am best acquainted, and, I think I may almost say, for the whole Western seaboard of Ireland, that whatever may be the feeling of the Western Irishmen as regards her Majesty the Queen, there never was a time when the Western peasant was more disloyal to the English connection; and the smaller landlords, the men who are being ruined by the land legislation, would not raise a hand to help this country in any difficulty she might be in.

THE MARQUESS OF LONDONDERRY: My lords, although my noble friends who have last spoken have alluded to the fact that I was to wind up this debate, I confess that after the extremely concise, explanatory, and, I think, complete speech of my noble and learned friend in introducing this measure no words are necessary from me to recommend the Bill to the support of your Lordships. But I do not think it would be right that the speech of the noble Earl who followed him should be passed over in complete silence by the Front Ministerial Bench. As an Irish landlord, the Bill will not affect me in the slightest degree, and consequently I can speak of it in the most disinterested manner. My feelings of justice force me to recognise that the Bill removes an unjust burden under which the land-owning classes have for many years laboured. The measure is not a "boon" or a "present" to the Irish landlords, as it has been described by the noble Earl opposite. To my mind it is not even an act of generosity or kindness. It is merely an act of ordinary justice; an honest endeavour to remove, very late in the day, a most unfair burden from the Irish landlords—a burden that would not be tolerated if imposed upon any other class in any other part of the kingdom. My noble and learned friend who introduced the measure stated that this small act of justice was of a very tardy character. Never were truer words said. The Irish landowners have lived many years in the hope that this tardy act of justice would be brought forward at some time or other. They remember the words of the present Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, who, as Lord Privy Seal, declared so long ago as 1888, speaking on behalf of the Government, that they recognised the difficulties under which Irish landlords laboured in regard to tithe rent-charge, and that it was their anxious wish to afford a remedy for a state of things which nobody could deny required immediate consideration. I am the most recent addition to the Government, but I

should say that the landlords of Ireland have a grievance in not having this act of justice done them, according to promise, years ago. What strikes me as very extraordinary is that there has been so much opposition to this measure, which is in itself so small. The amount of opposition to this Bill has filled me with amazement. After all, what is it that this measure enacts? It merely enacts that where a landowner has paid off the principal and interest the charge should cease to exist, and, secondly, that tithes should be variable as they were up to 1872, and as they are in England at the present moment. It is obvious that they should be variable. If you go back to the Book of Genesis you will find that tithe was a proportion of the produce of the producer. That principle has been recognised from time immemorial, but since the Act of 1872 revision of tithe has been made impossible in Ireland. My noble and learned friend stated with justice that the price of wheat and oats had fallen very materially in Ireland since 1872. I have ventured to look up the statistics, and I can endorse his remarks on that subject. In the year 1872 the price of wheat, which in Ireland is calculated by the barrel of 20 stone, was £1 9s. 11d. per barrel, but in 1899 the price had fallen to 15s. 6d. per barrel. I can endorse also what my noble and learned friend told the House with regard to the fall in the price of oats. In 1872 a barrel of oats fetched 14s. 8½d. in Ireland, or, according to English calculation, £1 6s. 8d. per quarter; but in 1899 it was only worth 10s. 1½d. per barrel, or 18s. 4d. per quarter. Under these circumstances it is only fair to ask that the tithe rent-charge should be varied. The noble Earl the Leader of the Opposition stated, I think, that it was after close calculation in 1872 that the charge was fixed permanently, but in 1872 I do not think anybody imagined that there was going to be the Act of 1881, under which rents could be compulsorily reduced periodically until eventually the tithe rent payer might be left with no margin at all. I know cases in which rents have been reduced by 30, 40, 50, and even 60 per cent.—I will not say one word as to whether they were rightly or wrongly reduced—but surely it is not right, after such reductions have been made, that there should remain the same permanent tithe rent-charge upon the landowner. You should pursue the same system in Ireland as you do in England, which this measure is endeavouring to carry out, and not ask a landlord, because he is an Irishman, to pay on a different scale from that which obtains in England. In the House of Commons the Home Secretary of the late Liberal Government denounced the Bill as an iniquitous encroachment upon the Irish Church Fund which was intended for the relief of unavoidable calamity and suffering in Ireland. The funds of the Irish Church have been used—and rightly used—for other measures than those to relieve unavoidable calamity and suffering. They have been used for arrears of rent, for sea-fishery loans, for the Intermediate Education Act, for the benefit of national school teachers, and for the Royal University. That attack comes with a very bad grace from a member of a Government who passed through the House of Commons a measure, fortunately rejected by your Lordships, for giving £250,000 out of the Church Fund to the evicted tenants—a body of men described by the Pope of Rome as having been guilty of an immoral action, and by the judges of the land as having taken part in an illegal conspiracy. Is it in the interest of the tenant-farmers that the Nationalist Members are opposing the Bill? I say "No," and I ask myself again the question—Are the Nationalist Members of Parliament, who are all members of the United Irish League, real friends of the tenant-farmers, and is it in the interests of those farmers that they are endeavouring to oppose the Bill? I say that if they were true friends of the Irish farmers they would at the present moment be endeavouring to assist that class to take advantage of the Technical Education Act for Ireland, and to make the most of their opportunies, but instead of doing so they are trying to induce them to leave their land derelict. The real secret of the determined resistance offered to the Bill in the House of Commons was explained recently by Mr. Dillon, when he said that the great object of the League, and consequently of the Nationalist members, was to abolish landlordism and drive it out of the country. Now we know the real reason of the opposition to this measure. It is to drive landlordism out of Ireland, because it is the one barrier to total separation from this kingdom. When Mr. Dillon tells us that it is the object of the United Irish League

to drive landlordism out of the country, I think it may be as well to consider whether it would be for the advantage of Ireland if this were to occur. I do not believe that the tenant-farmers generally desire that the landlords should be driven out of Ireland. Would it be beneficial to Ireland that the landlords should be expatriated? I reply deliberately that with the disappearance of the land-owning classes the ruin of Ireland would begin. The land-owning classes have been for generations past the backbone of the agricultural community in Ireland, and agriculture, as your Lordships know, is the great industry of the country. If you expatriate the landlords their places will be taken by the class below them, who, in their turn, may be forced out by the class below, and the result will be that Ireland will be owned and farmed by a race of men without capital and without resources, the majority of whom will be in the hands of the Gombeen-men. With that class of person in possession of Ireland there would be no confidence, and without confidence there would be no capital expended in Ireland. In the interests of Ireland it is the duty of your Lordships not only to relieve an injustice, but to retain in the country people who have its welfare at heart.

On Question, agreed to. Bill read 2ª accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

LAND CHARGES BILL [H.L.].

Commons Amendments considered (according to Order), and agreed to.

THE RESERVE FORCES OF AUSTRALIA.

LORD BRASSEY: My Lords, I think I shall best introduce the subject which I desire to bring very briefly under your notice with a few figures. The armed forces of Australia include for service afloat 350 permanent men, 1,250 reservists, and 1,350 naval volunteers. For the land service the numbers are 1,250 regulars, 8,000 militia, 13,000 volunteers, and 12,000 cadets, trained as the cadets are trained in the public schools of this country. When we compare these figures with the citizen army of the Swiss Republic, it will be clear that hitherto preparations for defence, with the exception, perhaps, of harbour defence, have not been regarded as a matter of urgency in Australia. There was no formidable enemy near at hand, and full reliance was placed upon the Imperial navy. To-day we stand in a different position. Patriotic feeling in the colonies has been keenly stirred. The war in South Africa has given occasion to our Australian fellow subjects to show how ready they are to share our responsibilities, and how great are the resources at their command. It seems a fitting opportunity to consider how best the mother country and the colonies may co-operate in the preparation of forces for the common defence. My Lords, I will deal first with the mounted infantry. The Australian colonies undoubtedly possess most exceptional resources for raising a force of that description. Every governor who serves in Australia is expected to travel widely over the country. Wherever he goes he is attended by a strong escort of mounted infantry, and it is impossible not to admire the endurance of men and horses under a fiery sun, and the skilful and bold horsemanship with which the escort will ride, fours abreast, over the most formidable timber fences. It was a natural reflection that here were men specially fitted for such a service as our forces have been called upon to render in South Africa. Privately I made inquiries, addressing myself to the Imperial and colonial officers in all the colonies, and I was assured that at least 5,000 men could be raised upon the same footing as our yeomanry at home, and at a comparatively small expense. It was much to be regretted that on a late occasion when there was a most patriotic desire to send contingents to South Africa, those 5,000 men were not ready at hand. In Victoria we had several hundreds of mounted infantry upon the muster-rolls, but they were recruited from a class which could not be expected to volunteer in large numbers for foreign service. The majority were small farmers, to whom it would have spelt ruin to leave their farms at the commencement of the harvest. The true men of the bush were not numerously represented in the first contingent which we despatched. They came in later when special efforts were made and Imperial subscriptions had been contributed, and the resources were available for preparing a corps of bushmen. A force ready to serve whenever required must consist of the younger men. It should be raised rather from the wage-

earning than from the wage-paying class. The training should be more complete, especially for the officers, than has hitherto been attempted in Australia. To a certain extent the force must be a paid force. Our mounted infantry in Victoria were not a paid force. I strongly urge that Her Majesty's Government should concert measures with the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia with a view to raising an Imperial Yeomanry in Australia of at least 5,000 men, under engagement to serve in any part of the Empire, the cost to be met by joint contributions from the Imperial Exchequer and from colonial funds. If the principle be accepted, a scheme could be best worked out on the spot by the commandants and the ministers of defence. It must take time to gather information, time to mature a plan, time to confer with the Colonial Government on the political considerations involved. The work I venture to say should be taken in hand without delay, in preparation for practical action as soon as the Federal Government of Australia has been set on foot. My Lords, I pass from the enrolment of a force of mounted infantry to the general efficiency of the colonial military forces. In deference to political considerations, the Imperial forces have been wholly withdrawn from the colonies. Their removal has left the colonies without infantry or cavalry up to the standard of smartness which can only be obtained by constant drill. In the altered circumstances in which we stand to-day the question of raising and maintaining a small Imperial force of infantry and cavalry in Australia would seem worthy of consideration. It will not be necessary that the forces should be kept at the full strength in the time of peace. A single squadron of cavalry and a few companies of infantry at the military headquarters in the several States would be of the greatest value for the instruction of large bodies of militia and volunteers assembled for reviews and for camps of exercise. They are needed to stiffen the Militia and Volunteers, which have not the advantage of constant drill. There is only one further suggestion which I should like to offer bearing upon efficiency. It is borrowed from a recent work by an eminent military writer, Sir George Clarke. I refer to the advantage of occasional, perhaps annual, inspections of the colonial forces by an Imperial officer of high standing. If it were possible that his Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught should pay a visit of inspection to Australia it would give great encouragement to loyal feeling, and I feel sure would be an immense advantage to the army. I may mention that under a recent regulation the naval forces of Victoria are annually inspected by the Commander-in-Chief on the Station, and that inspection has proved of the greatest advantage. My Lords, I pass from the military to the naval forces. Australia will not compare with the sister colony of Canada in the numbers of its seafaring population, but there are in Australia ample resources for the creation of a colonial naval reserve. Official inquiries have lately been made and it has been ascertained that we have, in the coasting trade and fisheries of Australia, more than 30,000 men. The men earn high wages, and those wages are well earned. The seamen in the coasting trade and fisheries of Australia are men of superior qualifications both in seamanship and in general intelligence and conduct. Having for many years taken the deepest interest in the question of a Colonial Naval Reserve, it was to me an immense satisfaction when I came home two years ago on leave, to hear from Mr. Goschen that the Admiralty had at last decided to take steps to raise a Colonial Naval Reserve. The announcement was followed by an official communication from the Commander-in-Chief on the Australian station. The terms offered by the Admiralty were identical with those established for the Naval Reserve at home, and without modifications they were not acceptable to the seafaring class in Australia. I may refer more particularly to the regulation requiring six months service on a man-of-war upon a low scale of wages. I earnestly hope that the Admiralty will not allow this matter to drop, and I would urge that instructions should be given to the Commander-in-Chief, directing him, in consultation with the local officers, to revise the regulations which are established for our Naval Reserve at home, so as to make them suitable to Colonial conditions. In this connection, I would like to say a few words with reference to the report made by the naval advisers of the Australian colonies with reference to this question of a Colonial Naval Reserve. That report has been criticised as a proposal to

establish a merely local force. I believe that report to have been misunderstood. The true feeling in the colonies must be gauged by recent events. When we stood in a recent crisis face to face with the sudden emergency in China, no objection was urged to the removal of certain vessels from the Australian squadron to China. The colonies offered a ship, which has been accepted; they offered the services of their naval brigades, which have also been accepted. What has happened lately I feel sure would happen again. I feel certain that all the available naval forces of the Australian colonies will at all times be available for Imperial defence. My Lords, I have only one other observation to make. The proposal that payment should be made from Imperial funds for the maintenance of forces in Australia may be challenged in certain quarters, but the principle of paying men from Imperial funds in Australia was accepted when the Admiralty consented to the enrolment of a Naval Reserve. If a retainer is paid to the seamen, why not to the mounted infantry? In conclusion, it seems to me clear that recent events have made it evident that steps must be taken to strengthen our military and our naval resources. If the work is to be done without imposing intolerable burdens, it must be by means of reserve forces, and I hope I have shown to the satisfaction of your Lordships that proposals for raising reserves in Australia should be included in the comprehensive scheme for which we look to the Government in the next session of Parliament.

*VISCOUNT FRANKFORT, in rising to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention had been drawn to a letter in *The Times* of July 12th "on Colonial Reserves," and whether he approved of the suggestion therein made by Major General French, commanding the New South Wales military forces; and whether he proposed to consult the Secretary of State for the Colonies in regard to the advisability of taking steps to obtain the insertion in the Federal Defence Act for all Australia, shortly to be brought forward, the necessary powers for the formation of such war reserve, said: My Lords, I have listened with great attention to the noble Lord who has just sat down. The question I have put on the Paper is rather with regard to war reserve than with regard to forces to be raised in the colony, but I think we must all agree that the defence of the Empire is a most important subject. A few days ago the Australian Commonwealth Bill received the Royal Assent, and there is no doubt that the people of Australia are willing to take their share in the defence of the Empire. I am anxious that no time should be lost in taking steps to obtain the insertion in the Federal Defence Act for all Australia of the necessary powers for the formation of a war reserve. The writer of the letter which appeared in *The Times* of the 12th of August is by no means an amateur. He has served some 12 years in Canada and a like number of years in Australia. He was more or less responsible on the military side for the Military Lands Act of 1884; at the present moment he is commanding the New South Wales Military forces. He has come to the conclusion that a scheme is feasible which would be mutually advantageous to England and the Colonies and of benefit to the Empire in which they live, and to use his own words "for which we ought to do our utmost." With regard to Canada, the suggestion Major General French makes is this. He suggests that the 75,000 fishermen and sailors on the Atlantic seaboard might make a very large and a very useful war reserve for our fleets. With regard to Australia the rate of wages current in Australia is so high that it is impossible to have a very large force for peace duties. But on the other hand any number of men will come forward in time of war at a fair rate of pay. Now what is proposed is to form a reserve of, say, 10,000 men with a retaining fee of £8 per man per annum for efficient privates of infantry, £12 per man per annum for troopers of mounted corps who have horses and saddlery effective for service, and other ranks in proportion. The approximate cost of this force at, say, £10 per head would be about £100,000. The requirements of efficiency would involve an annual course of training and musketry. This reserve force should be formed mainly from the efficient officers and men who have passed through the ranks of the defence forces, and who agree to serve within or without Australia in war time. The 6,000 men that are now out in South Africa would make a capital start for this reserve. As I have said, the notion is that the reserve pay is to be paid by the Imperial Govern-

ment as a retaining fee. I am quoting word for word from General French's letter. He knows well the feeling of the Colonies, and I think this paragraph is most important as regards pay for extra services. Your Lordships know that the Colonial Government are paying the difference between the imperial rate of pay and the rate of pay to their own men in South Africa. Major-General French goes on to say, "They might well do so in the future in view of the substantial advantage of having 10,000 trained reserves kept up in Australia in peace time at no expense to them." Thus, My Lords, by this scheme the imperial Government would have 10,000 men, and when they are called up for service in any future war they would only have to pay them the imperial rates of pay. I think steps should be taken by the Government to form a reserve in Australia something on these lines, and steps should be taken soon. As soon as the war in South Africa will allow it these Australian soldiers will go back to their country, they will be disbanded, they will disperse all over the country, and it will be most difficult to collect them again to form this reserve which I am suggesting. With these observations I beg to ask the noble Marquess the question standing on the Paper in my name.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (The Marquess of LANSDOWNE): My Lords, with the general principle laid down by the two noble lords, who have addressed your Lordships I desire to express my entire concurrence and sympathy. The war which is now going on in South Africa will be ever memorable as that in which for the first time the troops of this country and those of our great colonies have fought side by side, and I do not think we can overrate the deep impression which has been produced, not only upon the people of the United Kingdom, not only upon the people of the British Empire, but upon all parts of the world, by the exhibition of colonial patriotism and loyalty, which we have lately witnessed. Throughout these difficult and arduous operations, during the initial stages when success seemed to come to us with slow and halting steps, and later, when our progress has been more rapid and satisfactory, the colonial troops have borne a distinguished and honourable share in the hardships and in the dangers of the war. My Lords, as I have mentioned this, I am impelled to refer to the telegram which we all of us have read from Lord Roberts two days ago in which he mentions how in a recent hard-fought action beyond Pretoria, two young Canadian officers, when leading their men in a counter attack on the enemy's flank at a critical juncture of an important engagement lost their lives, one of them being the only son of the Canadian Minister of Militia and Defence, a young officer whom Lord Roberts describes as having twice before been brought to his notice in despatches for gallant and intrepid conduct. When we think who was the writer of that telegram, and with what feelings he must have written it, I think we may say that no more touching tribute could have been paid to the memory of these brave young representatives of our Colonial forces. With regard to the Australian contingents, I do not think the noble lord who spoke first at all overrated the value of the services which they have rendered. I think there are between 8,000 and 9,000 of them at this moment fighting for us in South Africa, and they have exhibited those qualities, not only of personal courage, but of great endurance, fine horsemanship, and resource and readiness which his experience of the Australian Colonies led him to attribute to them. I think the noble lord is perfectly right when he describes Australia as pre-eminently a country of mounted infantry. You have there men of the right stamp, and you have abundance of horses of the right stamp. There may be a certain difficulty in obtaining horses of the type that we require for cavalry and artillery, but the mounted infantry horses can be obtained in almost infinite numbers. I am sure we all of us feel that this co-operation of the colonial forces has not been the result of any passing mood on their part; it is not a mere momentary effervescence of loyalty, it is the result of a deep-seated patriotism and an abiding desire to bear with us a part in the burden of Empire. I am sure one and all of us would wish and hope that if this country should find itself again circumstanced as it has been of late we should find the colonies ready to take their place by our side. And if it would be possible, as the noble lord behind me desired, for us to come to some understanding with the colonies by which

that co-operation might be rendered easier both for them and for us, I for one should greatly rejoice at it. But I venture to suggest that the matter is one in which we can scarcely proceed with too much caution. I cannot help thinking that increased assistance in numbers and increased efficiency, might be too dearly bought if they were paid for by any loss of that wonderful spontaneity which has characterised the co-operation of the colonies on this occasion. I could not help being struck by the concluding sentence of the letter of General French, which the noble and gallant Lord quoted, in which he says:—"Now is the time to act. If we wait till the cold fit comes on progress may be made impossible." I cannot help saying that this sentence suggested to my mind an inference rather different from that which the writer probably intended to suggest. I should be sorry if we were at this moment to take advantage of the manner in which the colonies have come forward during the last nine or ten months in order to hurry them into any arrangement which upon mature reflection afterwards some might think irksome or inconvenient. I confess I am a little reminded of the analogy of the Volunteer Bill, which I lately passed through your Lordships' House and which was severely criticised by noble Lords opposite, who said we were endeavouring to persuade the Volunteers in a moment of popular excitement to assume permanently a liability which the force as a whole might afterwards object to. That provision met with an unfortunate fate in another place. But I think there is an object lesson to be drawn from that Bill, and I would say that if it is necessary to proceed with caution when we are dealing with our own forces in this country, still more must we be cautious when we are dealing with the forces of the colonies. I entirely agree with what the noble lord on the back bench said, that in a case like this the scheme must be worked out on the spot. There is no doubt about that. I also agree with him that it should be worked out under the supervision of that Federal Government which is about to come into existence under such auspicious circumstances. All I can say is that we are perfectly ready to discuss a scheme, but in our opinion it is desirable that the initiative should come from the colonies, and that we will certainly give them all the advice, all the assistance, and all the expert co-operation that they can possibly desire from us. The discussion of the details of such a scheme would at the present moment, I cannot help thinking, be a little premature. The two noble Lords seem to be agreed upon this, that they would like to see raised in the colonies a special body of troops, receiving special training, paid partly by us and partly out of colonial funds, and liable in certain circumstances for active service beyond the limits of the colony to which they belong. The noble Lord opposite spoke, I think, of a force of 5,000 Yeomanry. He did not mention the particular financial arrangements which he would recommend. The noble Lord behind me regarded with favour the scheme of General French, who proposes that we should have a force of 10,000 men in Australia, receiving, in time of peace, a retaining fee of from £8 to £12, to be paid by us, and who would be liable for active service in case of Imperial emergency. I must ask the noble lord to receive with a certain amount of caution General French's estimate of the relative cost of these proposals, because, I see that according to his calculation, while 10,000 British cavalry would cost this country £1,000,000 a year, 10,000 Australian mounted infantry would cost £100,000 a year. To begin with, I do not accept a calculation based upon a charge of £100 per head for each British cavalry soldier; and then, of course, it is impossible to make a fair comparison between the cost of troops who are only available for active service at rare intervals and on special occasions and the cost of troops whose liability is continuous and whom you can always make use of whether the emergency be great or little. There are obviously a great number of points which it would be necessary to consider with the greatest care before any scheme of this kind could really be adopted. I can only mention one or two of them. In the first place, I presume that if the British taxpayer is to be called upon to pay for these colonial reserves he will require to be satisfied as to the efficiency of the troops for whom he pays. Then would arise the question of the tests of efficiency which would have to be applied. Who would lay down those tests? Who would from time to time inspect these troops?

The Marquess of Lansdowne.

What facilities would they have for training at intervals?—these are all points which would require to be examined. Then there is the most important question as to the extent of the liability which these troops would be expected to assume. I think it was the noble Lord behind me who quoted General French's letter and proposed that these troops should be liable to be called upon within or without Australia in war time. Who is to decide whether the war is one of such importance as to justify a call upon the colonies? We know that in this country we cannot call out our Reserves, we cannot embody our Militia, we cannot call up the Volunteers without a proclamation of emergency. In the case of the colonies who would issue the proclamation of the emergency? Would it be the Parliament at home or the Parliament in the colonies? It would be very regrettable if it should ever happen that while in the opinion of one Parliament it appeared that there was emergency, it appeared in the opinion of the other Parliament that the emergency was not sufficient. Those are all points that would have to be looked in the face and, as the noble lord said, worked out on the spot before we could arrive at an understanding. There is another point. What would be the place of these colonial troops in the military system of their own colonies? The noble Lord knows very well that for many years past it has been our policy to concentrate our Imperial troops at home, in India, and in a few of the great garrisons. We have withdrawn our troops from the outlying colonies, and our policy has been to induce the colonies, so far as possible, to make arrangements for their own defence. Now, would the Empire really gain unless those colonial reserves, which the noble Lord wishes to form, were additional to the colonial forces required for the defence of the colony itself? If the Imperial Reserves were only a part of the colonial Militia, I do not think it would be very satisfactory if, at a time of emergency, we found ourselves calling away from the Colonies the very *élite* of their force. That would be what is called "picking the eyes" out of their little army. That, again, is a point that will have to be considered. Then the noble Lord made another suggestion. He said, "Why should we not raise in the colonies an Imperial corps of cavalry or infantry which would form part of the British Army, but which would be raised and maintained in the colonies?" The noble Lord knows the colonies a great deal better than I do, but I confess that I should have thought that an almost insuperable obstacle in the way of the adoption of such a proposal is the very high rate of wages which obtains in the colonies. General French tells us in his letter that the minimum rate of wages paid by Government contractors is 7s. a day. I am afraid that that is a rate which, when compared with the wages the British Army receives, becomes almost prohibitive. When the noble Lord, not long ago, was in communication with the War Office upon this subject calculations were made, and I believe the result was to show that a force of 5,000 men paid at the rate of 6s. a day would cost no less than £400,000 more than a similar force paid at Imperial rates; and at the rate of 7s. a day it would cost nearly half a million a year more. That is rather a formidable obstacle, I think, to the proposal that we should raise a part of the Imperial Army within the colonies.

LORD BRASSEY: I said only a small force for the purposes of instruction.

*The MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: No doubt the smaller the force the less the expense would be. One reason the noble Lord adduces in favour of his proposal—and I think it a very sound reason indeed—is that since we have withdrawn British troops from the colonies there has necessarily no longer been in the colonies that high standard of smartness and efficiency provided by the well-trained and permanently trained forces forming part of the Imperial Army. I confess I think it is extremely desirable that that standard should, if possible, be afforded, and an attempt has been made to arrive at that by a system of interchanging units between the colonial and the Imperial forces. I mean that a colonial corps should for a time take its place in a British garrison and a British force should take its place for a time in a colonial station. That is a matter that was discussed by the present Secretary of State for the Colonies at a conference with the Colonial Premiers in the year 1897. The idea was, on the whole, favourably received, and the War Office entirely approved of it. New South Wales, I believe, accepted the

proposal, and was prepared to exchange a company of its garrison artillery with a company of Imperial Garrison Artillery. I believe New Zealand made an offer, and in Canada there have been similar interchanges between the troops belonging to the garrison of Halifax and the troops belonging to the Canadian Militia. The matter was progressing far from unfavourably when unfortunately the war came, and put an end to the negotiations which were going on. With regard to Naval Reserve, I can say little of my own knowledge, but I am authorised to say that, in principle, the First Lord of the Admiralty entirely accepts the idea of a colonial Naval Reserve, but he thinks, as, no doubt, does the noble Lord opposite, that it would be more prudent to wait for the accomplishment of Federation before attempting to advance the matter any further. My Lords, I can only add to what I have said that, agreeably to the suggestion of the noble Lord behind me, I shall make it my business, in consultation with the Secretary for the Colonies, to advance the policy the noble Lord has advocated as much as we can possibly advance it. I can assure you no one hopes more anxiously and keenly than I do that in years to come we may find the soldiers of the great colonies fighting side by side with our own Imperial troops in the same patriotic and loyal spirit which they have exhibited during the war now in progress.

EARL CARRINGTON: I hope your Lordships will bear with me for one single moment while I express the pleasure with which we on this side of the House have heard the eloquent words of the Secretary of State for War, when he spoke of the patriotism of the Colonies, in answer to Lord Brassey, whom we are glad to see present after five years service rendered with so much pride to himself and so much advantage to the great colony of Victoria. With regard to what Lord Brassey has said as to colonial mounted infantry, perhaps I may be permitted to say that fifteen years ago when I was in Australia I was much struck with the possibilities of mounted infantry in those colonies, and it was with peculiar pleasure that I read that the New South Wales Lancers were the first of the colonial contingents to arrive at the Cape, the first to be sent to the front, and the first to come under fire. Lord Brassey spoke of the deep-seated patriotism that exists in the colonies. I hardly think that the colonists themselves know how deep-seated that patriotism is. It seems to me to be like one of those great Australian underground rivers that disappear in the bowels of the earth and then come up again, and appear and disappear again, and then when they are tapped they rise in a huge geyser, finally rushing down in a mighty torrent to the ocean. I think we can always rely on having the colonies on our side, but it must be on one condition. This country must recognise that there must be perfect equality between the soldiers of our great self-governing colonies and the English, Scotch, Welsh, and Irish troops. The noble Marquess said that we must move with great caution. Naturally, great caution is necessary, but I would venture very respectfully to suggest to him that we ought to insist that there shall be perfect equality between the Imperial and colonial forces, and that all honours and rewards shall be shared and dealt out equally to both branches of Her Majesty's servants in proportion to the strength of the men turned out.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR — HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL ARRANGEMENTS— COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY.

*THE EARL OF ABERDEEN, who had on the Paper notice of the following question: "To ask if Her Majesty's Government can inform the House when the Commission to inquire into the question of the treatment of the sick and wounded soldiers in South Africa is likely to be appointed," said: My Lords, the announcement which was made in the other House of Parliament after the question in my name was placed on the Paper of course anticipates the answer to this question, which has, therefore, a somewhat belated appearance. However, although very apologetically, I take advantage of the fact that the question is on the Paper, to say two words by way of expressing the hope that, notwithstanding the important avocations of members of the Commission, it will be possible for the inquiry to be commenced without delay, not only because of the great interest and importance of the matters in question, but because many of the individuals who could give evidence regarding the state of matters at the particular period in question may be dispersed. For

example, it was mentioned the other day in the newspapers that a certain number of the Canadian contingent were sailing for home from Liverpool. Some of these men were asked to contribute their impressions upon the matters referred to in this question, and I think the statements reported are significant. Of course I am only speaking from the reports given to the public; but what was said in effect was that in some respects there were things which were remembered with regret in regard to the medical arrangements, but at the same time they offered a hearty tribute of admiration with regard to other matters. I venture to think that that is significant, because in such vast operations as those of this war it is obvious that in certain sections of arrangements there might be defects or misfortunes, while side by side with those there were arrangements and matters calling forth only admiration. My Lords, I cannot refrain from expressing satisfaction, which, I am sure, will be common to all your Lordships, at the touching words of sympathy which fell from the noble Marquess, with regard especially to the death in South Africa of the two young Canadians, one being Lieutenant Borden, the only son of the Minister of Militia in Canada. The noble Marquess speaks not only as Secretary of State for War, but as a past Governor-General of Canada, and one whose name is familiar in the best sense in that country; and, as one of his successors in the position of Governor-General of Canada, I venture to assure the House that the words which fell from the noble Marquess will be welcomed throughout the Dominion with peculiar appreciation. With regard to the subject-matter of the question I would point out that at Netley there must be many soldiers invalided home from South Africa whose evidence might be taken regarding their experience at the seat of war. I trust that there will be no delay in the inquiry getting to work.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, I have every reason to believe that the Commission will commence its labours without any delay. The noble Earl is aware that the appointment to the two last seats in the Commission was only made yesterday or the day before. But I know that the Commission intend to meet immediately, and I know also that it is their desire to lose no time in taking up the important question committed to them.

House adjourned at ten minutes past Seven of the clock till To-morrow, half past Ten of the clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 19th July, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

DEARNE VALLEY RAILWAY BILL [Lords].

Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

GLYNCORRWG URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL GAS BILL [Lords].

LONDON SEA WATER SUPPLY BILL [Lords].

WHITECHAPEL AND BOW RAILWAY BILL [Lords].

Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

WORKINGTON RAILWAYS AND DOCKS BILL [Lords].

Ordered, That, in the case of the Workington Railways and Docks Bill [Lords], Standing Orders 204 and 235 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read a second time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Bill accordingly read a second time, and committed.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 211 and 236 be suspended, and that the Committee on the Bill have leave to sit and proceed upon Monday next.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

LONDON, WALTHAMSTOW, AND EPPING FOREST RAILWAY BILL.

Order (12th February) referring the London, Walthamstow, and Epping Forest Railway Bill to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills read, and discharged; Bill withdrawn.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

EDINBURGH (HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES) IMPROVEMENT SCHEME PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 211 and 236 be suspended, and that the Committee of Selection have leave to appoint

the Committee on the Bill, to sit and proceed forthwith.—(*The Lord Advocate.*)

PAISLEY WATERWORKS PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 211 and 236 be suspended, and that the Committee of Selection have leave to appoint the Committee on the Bill, to sit and proceed forthwith.—(*The Lord Advocate.*)

RAILWAYS (IRELAND) AMALGAMATION BILLS (JOINT COMMITTEE).

Report from the Joint Committee on Railways (Ireland) Amalgamation Bills in respect of the Great Southern and Western and Waterford and Central Ireland Railway Companies Amalgamation Bill [Lords] (Pending in the Lords) brought up, and read.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Report from the Joint Committee on Railways (Ireland) Amalgamation Bills in respect of the Great Southern and Western and Waterford, Limerick, and Western Railway Companies Amalgamation Bill [Lords] (Pending in the Lords), brought up, and read.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill.
Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill.
Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) Bill.
Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill.
Bray Urban District Council Bill, without Amendment.
Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill.
Lancashire, Derbyshire, and East Coast Railway Bill.
Lambeth Water Bill, with Amendments.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to empower the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the borough of Sunderland to contribute towards the construction by the North-Eastern Railway Company of a bridge and road across the River Wear, and to make provision for the construction of a new road in Southwick to join the same; and for other purposes." Sunderland Corporation Bill [Lords].

SUNDERLAND CORPORATION BILL [Lords.]

Read the first time, and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

PETITIONS.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

Petition from Lowick, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (No. 2) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Lowick and Alnwick; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Crieff, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TAXES AND IMPOSTS.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 13th March; *Mr Goddard*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 284.]

WHISKY IN BOND (SCOTLAND).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 19th June; *Mr. Gordon*]; to lie upon the Table.

COURT OF PROBATE DIVISION (HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE) (IRELAND).

Annual Account presented, of Receipts and Disbursements for the year ended 31st December, 1899 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

LAND REGISTRY.

Account presented, of Receipts and Payments in respect of the Land Registry for the year ended 31st March, 1900 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 285.]

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE AND COURT OF APPEAL, ETC.

Copy presented, of Account showing the Receipts and Expenditure in respect of the High Court of Justice and the Court of Appeal during the year ended 31st March, 1900 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 286.]

SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1887.

Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 29th June, 1900, granting a retired allowance to Mr. Thomas Alfred Inch, a Second Division Clerk (Higher Grade) under the Board of Trade, under the Act [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

IMPERIAL INSTITUTE (INDIAN SECTION).

Copy presented, of Annual Report of the Imperial Institute (Indian Section) for the year 1899-1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LAND LAW (IRELAND) ACT, 1887 (EVICTION NOTICES).

Copy presented, of Return of Eviction Notices filed during the Quarter ended 30th June, 1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TREATY SERIES (No. 4, 1900).

Copy presented, of Treaty of Friendship, Commerce, and Navigation between the United Kingdom and the Republic of Honduras. Signed at Guatemala, 22nd January, 1887. (Ratifications exchanged at Guatemala, 3rd February, 1900) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

GREENWICH OBSERVATORY.

Copy presented, of Report of the Astronomer Royal to the Board of Visitors of the Royal Observatory, Greenwich [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS.

CHINA—ANTI-FOREIGN OUTBREAK—ASSISTANCE TO REFUGEES.

MR. JOSEPH WALTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Barnsley): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether any steps have been taken to assist the escape of foreigners who have fled from the interior to places on the rivers or sea coast of China.

*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): All foreigners have been brought from Wenchow to Shanghai, and a vessel has been hired to bring away refugees from Chung King if necessary. At other Yang-tsze ports there are gunboats, and there are also men-of-war at Woosung held in readiness to proceed to any port where they may be required. Consul-General Warren was empowered on 12th July to take any steps in concert with the senior naval officer which may be considered necessary for bringing away refugees.

PEKING LEGATION NAVAL GUARD.

*SIR J. COLOMB (Great Yarmouth): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether the Admiralty know the names of the officer, non-commissioned officers, and men who formed the guard at our Legation at Peking, and if so, whether he will notify them to the press, and if the Admiralty have not ascertained the names will he take steps to do so.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. MACARTNEY, Antrim, S.): The names of the officers attached to the guard of Royal Marines at Peking are:—Captain Lewis S. T. Halliday, H.M.S. "Orlando"; Captain Bernard M. Strouts and Captain Edmund Wray, H.M.S. "Centurion," for service at Wei-hai-wei. The relatives have been informed, but the names were not sent to the press. The names of the non-commissioned officers and men are not known. If any certain news is received of the fate of the Peking Legations the Commander-in-Chief may be depended upon to inform the Admiralty by telegraph, but while it is uncertain he naturally does not do so.

*SIR J. COLOMB: Will the Admiralty take steps to ascertain the names?

MR. MACARTNEY: It is not necessary. The Commander-in-Chief will take the earliest possible steps to communicate the names.

*SIR J. COLOMB: I suppose the hon. Gentleman knows that there is great anxiety?

MR. MACARTNEY: Yes, Sir; and the Admiralty will take immediate steps to relieve that anxiety. As soon as the

Commander-in-Chief has trustworthy news he will, of course, communicate it.

INDIAN TROOPS FOR CHINA—COST.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether the expenses of the 22,000 troops withdrawn from the Indian establishment to serve in China will fall on the Imperial or on the Indian Exchequer; and whether provision will be made, having regard that no fewer than 90,000,000 persons in India are affected by the famine now devastating that dependency of the Crown, that the maintenance of the regiments, native or otherwise, now serving out of India be not charged directly or indirectly on the Indian revenue.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord G. HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): I have on several occasions stated that all the cost, both ordinary and extraordinary, of any Indian troops sent to China would be paid by the the Imperial Exchequer. The number so sent is not 22,000, but less than half that number.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Do I understand that the actual ordinary expenses of the regiment will be paid not by the Indian, but by the Imperial Exchequer? We have had this point raised before, and I want an explicit answer.

LORD G. HAMILTON: I have answered.

JAPANESE TROOPS FOR CHINA.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can state what is the number of Japanese troops now landed or about to land in China.

*MR. BRODRICK: According to our latest information about 14,000 men had either landed or were *en route* on 17th July. It is expected that 2,000 more will embark by Sunday next.

YANG-TSZE VALLEY—ENGLISH SUPPORT TO THE VICEROYS.

MR. YERBURGH (Chester): I beg to ask the Under Secretary a question of which I have given him private notice—namely, whether Her Majesty's Government are prepared to enter into engagements with the Viceroys of the Yang-tsze with the view of preserving peace and order in their respective jurisdictions, and whether they had given, or are prepared to give, definite and binding pledges to support the Viceroys.

*MR. BRODRICK: Her Majesty's Government have, as I have already informed the House, empowered Consul-General Warren to inform the Viceroys that in any efforts they may make to restore order they may count on the full support of Her Majesty's ships. No further pledges of support have been asked for or seem necessary.

MR. YERBURGH: In consequence of that answer, I give notice that I will repeat the question on Monday.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—TREATMENT OF BOERS IN BRITISH HOSPITALS.

*MR. H. D. GREENE (Shrewsbury): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether any considerable number of Boers have received medical or surgical assistance in our hospitals, and whether he can state approximately how many; whether any complaints have been received from the Boer Governments, Boer officers, or Boer patients in respect of the medical or surgical services rendered by us, or of the means and appliances provided by us, and whether there is any ground for believing that they have been dissatisfied; whether the medical and hospital assistance requisite for the care of the opposing forces tended by us in addition to our own was foreseen and arranged for; and whether he can state the number of our soldiers who have received medical or surgical aid in Boer hospitals.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Before the question is answered, may I inquire if the third paragraph of the question is not out of order, seeing that it embodies the expression of the opinion that the assistance was requisite?

*MR. SPEAKER: I wish the hon. Member was never more irregular.

*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): About 450 Boers have been admitted into British hospitals, mostly for

gunshot wounds. No complaints have been received. The probability that we might have occasionally to give medical and surgical assistance to Boers was foreseen, and they received the same treatment and attention as our men. There are no Returns showing how many of our soldiers were admitted to Boer hospitals.

TRANSPORT — CATERING ARRANGEMENTS ON THE "CUSTODIAN."

MR. PAULTON (Durham, Bishop Auckland): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether, on the arrival of the transport "Custodian" at Southampton, complaints were made to the staff officers on duty concerning the food supplied and the mess and canteen arrangements on board during the voyage from Cape Town; and, if so, what report has been made on the subject.

MR. MACARTNEY: The report of the officer commanding the troops during the voyage in question, which I shall be glad to show the hon. Gentleman, states that there was no cause of complaint in respect of the provisions issued, and that everything appertaining to the comfort of officers and men on board was well carried out. I am also informed that while one man complained to the embarkation officer of everything on board, his comrades did not support him and stated that his allegations did not merit inquiry.

THE "AVONDALE CASTLE" CANTEEN PRICES.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether the Queen's regulations for the Transport Service fixing the prices of canteen articles to be supplied to troops on board transport vessels were applicable to the R.M.S. "Avondale Castle," on her voyage from Southampton to Cape Town, between 12th May and 10th June, and, if they were applicable, why these regulations were not adhered to, seeing that the troops on board that vessel were charged a price for aerated waters double that prescribed by the regulations; and will he state what action will be taken by the War Office in the matter, having regard to the observations made by the officer in command in his report on the voyage, and to the possibility that similar non-observances of the regulations may recur.

*MR. WYNDHAM: The owners of the "Avondale Castle" have explained that the overcharge for aerated waters was made by mistake. The amount involved is small, but if the Volunteer battalion applies for its refund the owners will be asked for the money.

UNDER-AGE RECRUIT—PRIVATE WALSH, 1ST MUNSTER FUSILIERS.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether he can state if Private P. Walsh, 1st Regiment Munster Fusiliers, who is reported in despatches from Cape Town on Thursday last as having been wounded, is the same Private Walsh who was stated recently to have enlisted when under sixteen years of age; whether he has yet attained that age; and whether, in the event of his having been wounded, he will be sent home by the first available ship, and discharged from the Army with an adequate pension to assist in the support of his mother.

*MR. WYNDHAM: The Private Walsh is the soldier referred to by the hon. Member in his question of the 4th inst. The question of invaliding depends on the severity of the wound. Should his wound lead to his discharge, the amount of his pension will be decided in accordance with regulations by the Chelsea Hospital Commissioners.

MR. FLAVIN: Then this is the boy. Will he be sent home by the first available ship?

*MR. WYNDHAM: I have answered that question.

SOUTH DENES CAMP, YARMOUTH—COLLECTIONS BY THE SISTERS OF NAZARETH.

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to the regulations issued by Colonel Brownrigg, inspecting the Volunteers on the South Denes, Yarmouth, forbidding the Sisters of Nazareth to collect pennies from the 4,000 Volunteers now in camp; whether Colonel Brownrigg has any authority for issuing such regulations; and, if he is aware that the sisterhood who were sent back are of the same order as that which was so highly commended for nursing the sick and wounded in South Africa.

*MR. WYNDHAM: There is no information at the War Office on these incidents. The exclusion or admission of strangers in camp is a matter within the competence of Colonel Brownrigg, as officer commanding the brigade.

DR. TANNER: Is it the fact that these ladies were excluded in consequence of their religion?

*MR. WYNDHAM; I have no knowledge of the matter, but if the hon. Gentleman alleges that an unfair distinction has been drawn, and that privileges have been denied to these ladies which were granted to others, I will inquire into it.

DR. TANNER: I will repeat the question on Monday.

BOOTS AND CLOTHING FOR THE TROOPS.

GENERAL RUSSELL (Cheltenham): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether he has any information to the effect that Lord Roberts' army is now hampered by the want of boots, and that a large portion of the troops now under his command are almost barefooted.

*MR. WYNDHAM: In consequence of statements on this subject in the press, the Secretary of State had a telegram of inquiry sent to Lord Roberts on the 14th instant, and the following reply has been received—

"Pretoria, 18th July, 12.55 p.m.—The temporary break in communications and necessity for giving preference to troops and supplies occasioned delay in issue of boots and clothing to some units. The last consignment arrived to-day."

COLENSO ENGAGEMENT—COLONEL LONG'S REPORT.

GENERAL RUSSELL: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether it is the intention of the Government to publish Colonel Long's report regarding the abandonment of eleven guns at the battle of Colenso.

*MR. WYNDHAM: I must refer my hon. and gallant friend to the answers which have been given by the First Lord on the general question of the publication of despatches and reports.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: May I revive the hon. Gentleman's recollection that last March——

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Well, let me put it this way. I will, of course, at once sit down if you rule me out of order. Sir Redvers Buller made a serious attack on Colonel Long——

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is putting an obviously irrelevant question.

3RD INNISKILLING FUSILIERS.

MR. MACALEESE (Monaghan, N.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if he can state how many men of the 3rd Inniskilling Fusiliers, stationed at Cowshott Manor Camp, responded to the call made in February last to volunteer for service in South Africa; were any deprivations of privilege made in the case of men who then declined to volunteer; and how many men responded to a further call for Volunteers made upon this corps in the present month, and have any of the corps been visited with displeasure for refusal.

*MR. WYNDHAM: The 3rd Inniskilling Fusiliers were not asked by the Secretary of State for War to volunteer for service abroad either in February or later.

INVALIDED SOLDIERS—STATISTICS.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War how many officers, non-commissioned officers, and men have been invalided from South Africa since the outbreak of the war; of these how many have died on the passage home, or in military hospitals, or in their own homes; and how many have been incapacitated from further service by wounds or disease.

*MR. WYNDHAM: 20,658 have been invalided home; of these 63 died on the passage and 60 in military hospitals. There is no record of any having died in their own homes. 430 have been incapacitated from further service by wounds and disease.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Can you give roughly the proportion of officers?

*MR. WYNDHAM: The hon. Member did not ask for it, or I could have given it exactly.

CIVIL TRIBUNAL AT JOHANNESBURG.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, in addition to the military tribunal at Johannesburg, a Court styled the Court of the Chief Magistrate has been appointed over which an officer styled the Chief Magistrate presides; whether this Court has cognisance of and jurisdiction in all criminal cases except murder, treason, sedition, rape, robbery, arson, and concealment of arms; whether the Chief Magistrate is empowered to inflict sentences not exceeding two years imprisonment, fines not exceeding £100, and to sentence to the punishment of flogging, the flogging not to exceed 100 lashes; and whether the Colonial Secretary can give any explanation of the establishment of this tribunal, and on what evidence Sir Alfred Milner, as High Commissioner, has sanctioned the establishment of a tribunal to which the power of sentencing to the lash is entrusted.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): I have no information. All the arrangements for preserving law and order in the Transvaal are entirely in the hands of Lord Roberts.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: As this is a matter of flogging, will the right hon. Gentleman ask his agent, Sir Alfred Milner?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: No, Sir.

MARTIAL LAW—PAPERS ON THE CAPE REBELS.

MR SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether any Papers in reference to South Africa, especially in reference to the communications between the Home Government and the Cape Government in regard to the Cape rebels, will be presented before the Colonial Vote is taken.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I hope the Papers will be in the hands of Members before the Colonial Vote is taken.

ARMY CHAPLAIN AT HONG KONG.

MR. BRODIE HOARE (Hampstead): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether there is a commissioned chaplain to the forces at Hong Kong; if not, whether, in view of the importance of Hong Kong as a military base, immediate steps will be taken to appoint one.

*MR. WYNDHAM: Commissioned chaplains are, as a rule, sent only to the larger foreign stations. There is an acting chaplain at Hong Kong who devotes his whole time to the troops. He is at present, however, on leave, and his duties are being discharged by the local clergy. The question of an increase in the establishment of chaplains is under consideration. The House is aware that the Hong Kong garrison has recently been reduced.

LORD HUGH CECIL (Greenwich): Is the hon. Gentleman aware that the supply of chaplains has been found to be insufficient in the present South African campaign?

*MR. WYNDHAM: There was a time, perhaps, when it was not sufficient, but I believe every demand has now been supplied.

SENTRY DUTY IN THE METROPOLIS.

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, S.E.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if he can state what number of men are detailed for guards and sentry-go in the metropolis in each twenty-four hours when the battalions and regiments are on home service, and what is the necessity, if any, of posting sentries over empty buildings and public offices when protection could be afforded by the police; and whether the sentry on the War Office was incapacitated by the heat on Tuesday.

*MR. WYNDHAM: There are five officers and 218 non-commissioned officers and men detailed for guards and sentry-go in the metropolis. There are no sentries over empty buildings. The matter has been very thoroughly considered and the numbers in recent years have been largely reduced. The sentry on the War Office was unfortunately overcome by the heat on Monday.

MAJOR RASCH: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that a man in a tunic

buttoned close up to his throat, and wearing a heavy busby, and carrying a rifle on a beat extending only ten yards, cannot be a very mobile protector?

[No answer was given.]

OUTLAY UPON BELLEVILLE BOILERS.

MR. HEDDERWICK (Wick Burghs): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if he can state approximately the amount spent upon Belleville boilers for the Navy during the last five years.

MR. MACARTNEY: It is not possible to state the amount spent upon Belleville boilers, as they are included in the tender for the propelling machinery and are not priced separately.

MR. HEDDERWICK: Has the hon. Gentleman no approximate idea of the cost?

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): Is it not over £5,000,000?

MR. MACARTNEY: I can give no other answer. It would involve an examination of all the contracts.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Cannot you say the cost within a million?

[No answer was given.]

BRITISH SOUTH AFRICA COMPANY—REPORTED TRANSFER TO THE CROWN.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Government have been negotiating with the British South Africa Company for the transfer of its territory to the Crown.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: No, Sir. I have heard the rumour, but there is not an atom of foundation for the suggestion contained in the question.

BRITISH TRADE IN MADAGASCAR.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydfil): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether any, and, if so, what reply has been received to the representations made by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to the French Government in July, 1898, that their action in greatly increasing the import duties upon the principal articles of British manufacture was a further infraction of British rights in Madagascar, inconsistent with the international rights of this country, and with the assurances given by the Government of the Republic.

*MR. BRODRICK: No direct reply has been received to the representations made in 1898, the French Government having stated that they adhered to the reply upon the subject which was made by Monsieur Hanotaux on the 23rd April, 1897. This reply has already been laid before Parliament.

CABLE COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE WEST INDIAN ISLANDS.

MR. TOMLINSON (Preston): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware that, although the Island of Jamaica is now in direct telegraphic communication with the British Empire through British cables by Turks Island, Bermuda, and Halifax (Nova Scotia), no steps have yet been taken to establish a direct communication between Jamaica and the other West Indian Islands, and that the cables connecting Jamaica with the fortified coaling station of St. Lucia and the Islands of Barbados, St. Vincent, and Trinadad, and the other West Indian Islands, as well as the mainland of British Guiana, all touch foreign soil at one or more points; whether he is aware that British Honduras is also dependent upon foreign cables, and that if a colonist in British Honduras wishes to telegraph to the United States or England he has to take a journey into the neighbouring Republics of Guatemala or Spanish Honduras in order to do so; whether the Colonial Office have these matters under consideration; and whether he can hold out any hope of being able to deal speedily with these grievances.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The facts are as stated. The points raised in the hon. Member's question have been carefully considered, and will not be lost sight of. Considerable expenditure would be involved, and I cannot promise any immediate action in the matter.

INDIAN FAMINE—LOANS TO NATIVE STATES.

SIR WILLIAM WEDDERBURN (Banffshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is now in

a position to specify the amounts advanced by the Government of India to the several native States by way of famine loans; whether, when making each loan, the Government of India ascertained that the State was exercising economy in its general administration, with a view both to the relief of the famine-stricken and the repayment of the loan; and whether the Bhaunagar State in Kattywar applied for a famine loan of 30 lakhs, what is the reason why Bhaunagar, recently prosperous, is now in financial straits, and has the Government of India satisfied itself that this State has reduced all unnecessary expenditure both in India and in England.

LORD G. HAMILTON: The total amount of loans to native States for relief purposes sanctioned up to the end of May, either from Government funds or on Government guarantee, was £1,217,000. A list of these loans will be found at the end of the Papers presented to Parliament regarding Famine Relief in Native States, which Papers will, I hope, be distributed before the end of next week. The Government of India has repeatedly inculcated strict economy on native States suffering from famine and applying for financial assistance. Applications for loans to such States and their conduct of relief measures are subjected to such scrutiny and supervision as are possible without undesirable interference. Bhaunagar is undoubtedly a prosperous State, but its Government has recently invested £507,000 in its railways, and had a working cash balance of only £20,000 at the beginning of the year. Owing to the famine, its income has shrunk and its expenditure has increased considerably. The net deficit to be met was estimated in March last at £147,000, and so the State applied for and received a large loan from the Government. The ways and means of the State, its intended expenditure, and the possible economies to be made were considered by the Government of India before the loan was granted.

REMISSIONS OF LAND REVENUE.

SIR WILLIAM WEDDERBURN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that in the famine of 1896–7 the Government of the North-West Provinces remitted land revenue to the extent of Rs.6,000,000, while the Government of Bombay remitted Rs.15,000; and whether, looking to the remarks of the Famine Commissioners of 1898, who approved the liberal remissions in the North-West Provinces as mitigating distress, while taking exception to the course followed in Bombay, he will urge upon the Bombay Government a more liberal policy than that followed by them in 1896–7.

LORD G. HAMILTON: In the North-West Provinces, where the population of the affected districts may be taken to have been 19½ millions, the Government during the famine of 1897-8 remitted revenue to the extent of six million rupees; in Bombay, on a population of eight millions, about 800,000 rupees were either remitted or suspended, and 5,300,000 rupees were loaned out to occupiers. The Commissioners point out in their Report that the land revenue assessment of the Bombay Deccan is admittedly light; and, on the whole, I am not prepared to accept without reservation the hon. Member's version of their opinion as to the measures taken in the North-West Provinces and in Bombay respectively. So far as the famine is concerned I have every reason to believe that the Bombay Government are acting in a judicious and liberal spirit towards the cultivators under their jurisdiction. In Guzerat alone the Bombay Government report that they had up to July deliberately left uncollected two-thirds of the land revenue in the affected districts.

SIR WILLIAM WEDDERBURN: The noble Lord will understand I am referring to remissions and not suspensions?

LORD G. HAMILTON: Quite so.

RAINFALL IN THE FAMINE AREAS.

SIR MANCHERJEE BHOWNAGGREE (Bethnal Green, N.E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he has official information to the effect of the telegraphic news received since yesterday of satisfactory rainfalls having taken place in the areas affected by the famine; if so, can he give the total of the rainfall since the monsoon set in up to date in several affected districts, and state if it is regarded as decidedly improving the prospects of the ensuing crops in those parts.

LORD G. HAMILTON: I am glad to say that I have received a report of good rainfalls in most parts of the famine area. The telegram giving this intelligence was dated Simla, the 14th July, and has been published in the newspapers. But I am afraid I cannot at present give precise figures of the rainfall up to date in the several affected districts.

CATTLE IN THE FAMINE DISTRICTS—SUPPLIES OF SEED GRAIN, FODDER, ETC.

MR. C. P. SCOTT (Lancashire, Leigh): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India if he can state what, approximately, are the percentages of deaths among the cattle in the famine districts, and what funds are available for the supply of cattle, fodder, and seed grain to the cultivators in these districts; and what steps are being taken to secure a supply of fodder for the surviving cattle, and what proportion of the cattle recently supplied to make good previous losses have died from want of fodder.

LORD G. HAMILTON: I have no precise figures about the mortality among cattle. We shall learn some months hence what approximately the losses have been in British districts when the yearly returns are made up of the number of cattle alive. No similar returns are made for native States. The funds at present allotted for the supply of seed grain and cattle to cultivators in British districts are 123 lakhs for advances to cultivators. The charitable funds have also distributed for the same purpose a considerable sum to the poorer cultivators. Strenuous efforts were made in parts of the Bombay Presidency to collect and distribute fodder earlier in the season. Now that rain has come and grass is growing I do not anticipate that further endeavours in that direction will be required. I am not able to say what proportion of the recently supplied cattle have perished from lack of fodder or from lack of water.

CHOLERA IN THE FAMINE DISTRICTS.

MR. C. P. SCOTT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether, in view of the outbreak of cholera in the famine districts of India, any, and, if so, what, addition has been made to the famine medical service; and whether he can state the number of deaths from cholera in the famine districts.

LORD G. HAMILTON: I am not able to state the number of additional medical officers and medical subordinates sent to the famine districts in consequence of the outbreak of cholera. I was informed that, as regards the worst cholera tract in the middle of June, the local authorities there had received as much extra medical help as they thought necessary. The returns which have reached me show that during the month of June 22,198 cholera deaths were reported from British famine districts, and there were 19,122 from native States similarly afflicted. During the three weeks ending on the 7th July, the reported cholera deaths averaged 6,562 a week for British famine districts and 6,185 a week for native States affected by famine.

INDIAN PENAL LAWS.

*SIR WILLIAM WEDDERBURN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether, looking to the loyalty and patience manifested by the Indian people while suffering from grievous calamities, and looking to the benfit to Imperial interests from such manifestation at the present time, he will consider whether, by withdrawing recent penal legislation, this loyalty may be recognised, and the Indian people assured of the confidence and appreciation of Her Majesty's Government.

LORD G. HAMILTON: The loyalty, courage, and resignation manifested by the Indian people in the face of most grievous calamities are most fully appreciated by Her Majesty's Government and by the people of this country, and on more than one occasion both the Viceroy in India and I, as Secretary of State in England, have given unstinted expression to our admiration of their demeanour and conduct. I do not know what the hon. Member means by withdrawal of recent penal legislation, for certainly during my tenure of office no such legislation has been sanctioned.

*SIR WILLIAM WEDDERBURN: Does not the noble Lord understand that I refer to the law with regard to the press and sedition, which now appear not to be necessary?

LORD G. HAMILTON: If the hon. Baronet will be good enough to examine that law I think he will find it exactly

the same as that which obtains in this country.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Remember the case of the Natu Brothers.

NEW TAXATION IN INDIA SINCE 1886.

SIR WILLIAM WEDDERBURN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he will grant a Return showing the amount yielded by new taxation imposed in India in or since the year 1886, and stating in each case the purpose for which such taxation was at the time said to be imposed.

LORD G. HAMILTON: There is no objection to the motion for the Return which the hon. Baronet desires.

THE COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF IN INDIA.

MR. BUCHANAN (Aberdeenshire, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India how long has the office of Commander-in-Chief in India been vacant, and when is an appointment to be made.

LORD G. HAMILTON: Sir W. Lockhart died suddenly on the 18th of March, and since then General Sir Power Palmer has discharged, as acting Commander-in-Chief, the functions of the office. A permanent appointment will be made before long.

SILVER COINAGE.

MR. W. F. D. SMITH (Westminster): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the coinage of five-shilling and four-shilling pieces is to be continued, and whether he can state if any representations have been made by retail traders as to the inconvenience of these coins.

*THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): The coinage of double florins has been discontinued since 1891. Those remaining in circulation are in course of withdrawal. No representation as to the inconvenience of crowns is recorded as having been received at the Mint or the Treasury. Only a very small proportion of the silver pieces issued is in crowns. In 1899, out of an issue of 32,129,100 of such pieces, only 159,100 were crowns. It is not proposed to discontinue their issue.

INCOME TAX—INTEREST ON MUNICIPAL LOANS.

SIR ALFRED HICKMAN (Wolverhampton, W.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will state the reasons why income derived from payments for interest made by municipal authorities is charged with the full duty of 1s. in the pound for the whole period in respect of which the same is payable, whereas income derived from similar payments made by public companies or private persons is calculated at the increased rate only since the date when the increased duty was imposed.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: The distinction, which leads to a difference of treatment in respect of income tax, between income derived from payments for interest made by municipal authorities, and income derived from similar payments made by public companies or private persons, lies in the fact that in the latter case the interest is paid out of profits and gains assessable to income tax, while in the former it is (as a rule) paid, or partly paid, out of rates, which are not so assessable. In this latter event Sub-section 3 of Section 24 of the Customs and Inland Revenue Act, 1888, applies, and this distinctly prescribes that the rate of income tax shall be that in force at the time of payment. I may be allowed to add I think that some public inconvenience is caused by the existing difference of treatment in this matter, and I propose to examine the possibility of adopting a uniform system.

MR. BARTLEY (Islington, N.): Will regard be had to the case where there is obviously a charge in excess, like the Jamaica railway debentures?

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: No. I do not think that was a case of excessive charge.

PRISON TREATMENT OF DEBTORS.

MR. J. A. PEASE (Northumberland, Tyneside): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he can state how many persons are at present detained as debtors in Her Majesty's gaols, whether under the prison rules such persons are obliged to wear prison uniform, and whether their treatment as to food, exercise, and such matters differs in any particular from those convicted of criminal offences.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Sir M. WHITE RIDLEY, Lancashire, Blackpool): There were 474 male and eleven female debtors in custody on the 17th instant. Debtors are permitted to wear their own clothing unless it is unfit for use, in which case they wear the same uniform as prisoners awaiting trial whose clothes are unfit for use. They have the same food as offenders of the first division, and are allowed to exercise twice a day. Generally speaking, their treatment differs in almost every particular from that of convicted prisoners.

METROPOLITAN POLICE FORCE.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he can state whether the Metropolitan Police Force is at present below its establishment, also whether desirable recruits are now forthcoming in sufficient numbers and continue to remain in the force.

*SIR M. WHITE RIDLEY: The force is at present below its establishment chiefly owing to the Reservists being called out for service with the colours. A sufficient number of properly qualified recruits is forthcoming to rather more than meet the normal needs of the force, but not sufficient to replace the absent Reservists or to make good augmentations. The answer to the last few words of the question is in the affirmative.

UNDELIVERED POSTCARDS.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, seeing that undelivered postcards are returned to the senders only on the condition that a request for their return must be placed on the outside before posting, and on the payment of a return postage of one halfpenny on delivery, while undelivered letters are returned to the senders without any extra charge or request for their return, whether he can say why postcards are differently dealt with, and which side of a postcard the Post Office authorities describe as the inside.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. HANBURY, Preston): These postcards are treated differently from letters, because the halfpenny post is not in itself remunerative, and in the great majority of cases the return to the sender of undeliverable matter passing at the halfpenny rate is not desired and involves much useless labour. Such packets can be returned, if the sender so desires, by placing on the address side a request to that effect. The official regulations make no reference to the "inside" of a postcard.

CENTRAL TELEGRAPH OFFICE OVERTIME.

MR. WOODS (Essex, Walthamstow): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether, in view of the amount of overtime performed by the staff at the Central Telegraph Office, London, the Postmaster General is considering the advisability of increasing the number of operators; whether it is intended that such increase should be effected by the addition of unestablished telegraphists at lower wages than the ordinary clerks receive; and, whether the Postmaster General will take steps to provide that all new telegraphists shall be placed in a position with reference to pay and other rights similar to that of the present established staff of the London office.

MR. HANBURY: The Postmaster General is considering the advisability of adding to the staff in the Central Telegraph Office in order to reduce overtime, but it is not intended that unestablished telegraphists should be employed for that purpose. Officers appointed to the established class of telegraphists will receive the pay and privileges proper to that class.

COOTEHILL (CAVAN) POSTMASTERSHIP.

MR. SAMUEL YOUNG (Cavan, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he has examined the correspondence which passed in 1897 and 1898 relative to the appointment of the previous postmistress of Cootehill, county Cavan; and, whether, seeing that a condition requiring her to give up her private business was attached to the appointment, he can state why a similar condition was not attached to the appointment of the present postmaster; and whether he is at liberty to say on the authority of what official his recent statement was made.

MR. HANBURY: There was no condition attached to Miss Corry's appointment such as the hon. Member describes. Miss Corry had no private business, but resided with her relative, the previous sub-postmistress of Cootehill, to whom she acted as assistant. The newly appointed sub-postmaster is not required to give his whole time to the public service, and it is not necessary, therefore, that he should relinquish his business as chemist. My recent reply was given on the authority of the Postmaster General.

NEWBLISS POST OFFICE.

MR. MACALEESE: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that the late postmistress at Newbliss, county Monaghan, still resides in the post office in that town, notwithstanding that her successor was appointed several months ago; and can he state who is the tenant of the Newbliss Post Office, and if the late postmistress is still the tenant, is that arrangement in accordance with General Post Office practice; and will he say how many females are employed there as telegraph practitioners or learners, and whether complaints have been made to the chief postmaster in Dublin that some of these young women are occasionally employed as postal messengers; and how many persons altogether, male and female, are employed in connection with this post office, and how many are Roman Catholics.

MR. HANBURY: The fact is as stated. The late sub-postmistress of Newbliss still resides in the house in which the post office is situated, and there is no objection, under the rules of the Department, to her so doing. The present sub-postmistress is the tenant of the premises. One female assistant and one female telegraph learner are employed at the Newbliss office; and the services of these persons are occasionally utilised in the delivery of telegrams. It is not known that any complaints have been made against this practice, which is not in violation of any rule. The total number of persons employed in connection with the Newbliss office is nine—six men and three women. Nothing is known as regards their religion.

R.I.C. MEDICAL APPOINTMENT FOR TIPPERARY.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that on the death of Dr. Nadin, Tipperary, who was doctor to the Royal Irish Constabulary at various stations, the men in each barrack were asked to choose a successor, and their choice was ratified in every case except Tipperary and Limerick Junction, where the police, thirty-four in number, almost unanimously selected Dr. O'Dwyer, but that in this case the County Inspector intervened and recommended a practitioner who had only received one or two votes, and that Dr. O'Dwyer was then set aside by the Inspector General and the position given to the nominee of the County Inspector, although his qualifications were in no respect superior; and will he explain why the wishes of the force were not allowed to prevail in this case as in that of all the other vacancies created by the death of Dr. Nadin.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. G. W. BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): I am informed it is not the fact that the police at any of the stations in question were asked to choose a successor to Dr. Nadin. The gentleman selected for appointment at Tipperary and Limerick has been longer in practice than Dr. O'Dwyer, and had also attended the police on previous occasions when the late medical attendant was unable to do so, and had given every satisfaction. While of course every attention is given, as far as possible, to the wishes of the constabulary in a matter of this kind, the choice of a medical attendant is not with the men, and the rule is to appoint the most experienced and most suitable doctor.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Do I understand that in the other cases no steps were taken to consult the wishes of the police?

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: I do not know how far their wishes were consulted. Whatever was done was done in an informal manner.

MR. T. M. HEALY: However informal, is it not the fact that in all cases, except that of Tipperary, the wishes of the constabulary were met?

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: That I cannot say.

GRAZING IN PHŒNIX PARK, DUBLIN.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he will state the annual profit received by the Government from letting the Phœnix Park for grazing cattle, and whether any of the London parks are similarly let; is he aware that the bullocks in the Phœnix Park are not herded, but continually stray on the roads and paths, to the annoyance of the public; that filth from the cattle disfigures the walks; that they are allowed to trample down and dirt that portion of the sward of the park most used for games by the citizens; and that in the London parks sheep are introduced whenever it is necessary to eat down the grass; and whether any steps will be taken, by efficient herding, to prevent the Phœnix Park roads and walks from being obstructed and defiled by cattle.

MR. HANBURY: The average annual receipts from grazing rents in the Phœnix Park during the past five years were £626 3s. 4d. There is no grazing in St. James's Park, but £64 a year is received for grazings in Hyde Park and the Green Park. No complaint has been received from the public with regard to the bullocks. The size of the park renders it impossible to prevent completely the straying of cattle on the roads, but every effort is made to keep the cattle off the roads (especially the main road) and preserve the cleanliness of the walks. No serious inconvenience with regard to games has arisen, and no complaint has been made. Sheep are introduced into some of the London parks to eat down the grass. A similar plan was tried in Dublin some years ago, but the grass did not suit sheep.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Are herds employed to keep the cattle off the path?

MR. HANBURY: Yes, Sir.

IRISH BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS—ASSISTANT SURVEYOR OF BUILDINGS.

SIR GEORGE FARDELL (Paddington, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he will explain why Mr. R. W. Carden, the successful candidate at the recent examination for the situation of assistant surveyor of buildings in the Architectural Department of the Board of Public Works, Ireland, after having received notice of his success, has been rejected, although his qualifications fulfil the requirements set out in the special regulations issued by the Civil Service Commission on 27th April, 1900, respecting such examination; and whether it is proposed to appoint Mr. Donaldson because he happens to be at the present time in the temporary service of the Department.

MR. HANBURY: Mr. Carden was rejected because his qualifications did not fulfil the requirements to which the hon. Member refers. They were *prima facie* satisfactory; but they did not bear close investigation. No appointment will be made on the result of the examination.

TRACTION ENGINES ON IRISH ROADS.

MR. MACALEESE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland—1. Have any representations been made to him about the state of the law in Ireland in relation to the use of traction engines on public roads. 2. Is he aware that owing to the use of such engines on the coast road between Glenarm and Larne the road authority finds the cost of maintenance so materially increased as to be a source of embarrassment, while no power exists by which they can oblige the owners of the engines to contribute to the cost of repairs to the road. 3. Is he aware that the County Antrim Grand Jury passed resolutions calling upon the Government to assimilate the law in Ireland to that of England in regard to the passage of traction engines along public roads, complaining at the same time that the owners of these engines carry on their traffic under most illegal conditions. 4. And will he introduce a clause into his Bill to amend the Local Government (Ireland) Act, placing the law in Ireland upon the same footing with the law in England.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: Representations have been made to me of the character mentioned in the first paragraph. The average expenditure on the coast road between Glenarm and Larne has been increased about 30 per cent. within recent years; I am unable to say whether this increased expenditure has resulted in any embarrassment as alleged, but, if so, the case would appear to be one in which an application for an extension of the limit under Section 27, Subsection 2, of the Local Government Act,

1898, would probably be entertained by the Local Government Board. The answer to the third paragraph is in the affirmative. The Amendment suggested in the last paragraph would not be covered by the title of the Bill now before the House. Under Section 23 of the Highways and Locomotives Act, 1878, as amended by Section 12 of the Locomotives Act, 1898, damages can be recovered by the local authority in England in respect of excessive wear on highways by reason of extraordinary traffic. These enactments do not, however, apply to Ireland, but I will consider the question of assimilating the law in this respect in the two countries with a view to possible legislation in a future session.

THE BOTANICAL GARDENS, DUBLIN.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he can state what has been the annual expenditure for the past ten years on Kew Gardens, London, and the Botanical Gardens, Dublin.

MR. HANBURY: The total gross expenditure from 1890–1 to 1899–1900 was —On Kew Gardens, £261,408 5s. 10d.; on the Botanical Gardens, Glasnevin, £18,769 6s. 1d.

Mr. T. M. HEALY: Will the right hon. Gentleman be good enough to consult the Secretary for the Colonies as to the desirability of making an extra grant for the Botanical Gardens, Dublin?

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Give us some orchids.

SUTTON TO HOWTH TRAMWAY.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the effort to represent the passing of the Bill to extend the time for the completion of the Great Northern Tramway from Sutton to Howth as an exoneration of the manner in which the work has up to the present been done; and whether, before sanctioning an inspection of the line by his inspectors, he will obtain an undertaking from the company that fresh Parliamentary powers will be applied for, or else enforce compliance with the original Act prescribing that the tramway shall be laid along the road and with its rails on a level therewith.

MR HANBURY: The company state that if Parliamentary powers are necessary to authorise the deviation which has been made at the request of the grand jury, they will take an early opportunity of applying for them. In the meantime, the Board of Trade do not think it would be in the public interest to decline to allow an inspection for the purpose of ascertaining whether the line can be safely worked.

LISTOWEL TO TARBERT RAILWAY.

MR. FLAVIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will receive a deputation with a view of giving a grant of money or providing a means for giving such grant, for the construction of a railway from Listowel via Newtown Sandes and Ballylongford to Tarbert; and whether, in view of the fact that a portion of the district is congested, and of the want of travelling facilities as well as of employment to the poor, he will favourably consider the request made.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: There are no funds available for the construction of a railway from Listowel to Tarbert, and therefore no useful purpose would be served by my receiving a deputation, as suggested in the question.

MR. FLAVIN: Will the right hon. Gentleman receive a deputation?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! That is exactly the question the right hon. Gentleman has answered.

MR. FLAVIN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that a large number of meetings can be held in North Kerry calling on the Government to make a grant?

CAPTAIN DONELAN (Cork, E.): Can the right hon. Gentleman not find a slice of the Church Fund for this purpose?

POLICE PROTECTION NEAR LISTOWEL.

MR. FLAVIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the number of police employed in protecting the farm in Derry situate near Listowel, the property of John Sands, and whether the police so employed cost the district £160

per year; and, if not, how much; and whether, having regard to the present condition of the district, the extra police so employed on this farm will be removed.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: Two constables are employed in protecting the caretaker on the farm referred to. They will be removed when, in the opinion of the authorities locally responsible, the necessity no longer exists for their employment. The men are supplied from the free force of the county, consequently their employment entails no charge whatever either to the district or the county.

MR. FLAVIN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the whole duty these men have to perform is to arrest the emergency man and charge him with drunkenness?

CELTIC MANUSCRIPTS—SALARY OF IRISH SCRIBE.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that an annual sum of £200 has been voted from 1865 to 1891 to the Royal Irish Academy as salary to an Irish scribe, including cataloguing and printing Irish manuscripts, and that a like sum has been included in the general grant-in-aid voted to the said Academy between 1892 and 1899; whether the transcription of Celtic manuscripts ceased on the death, in 1880, of Mr. O'Longan, the last of the Irish scribes, whether the copying of Irish manuscripts since 1880 has been by photograph, and whether the photographing of old Irish manuscripts ceased with the completion of the Yellow Book of Leccan in 1895; and, if so, can he say what has been done with the £200 a year voted for Irish scribes since 1880, and the £200 a year for printing Celtic manuscripts since 1893; whether the proceeds of the sale of the four folio volumes facsimiled or photographed at the expense of Parliament have been refunded to Her Majesty's Treasury, or spent on the general purposes of the Royal Irish Academy; and whether, if the Royal Irish Academy be unwilling to publish Celtic manuscripts, he will consider the desirability of transferring the present annual grants for this purpose to some of the other existing antiquarian societies in Ireland.

MR. HANBURY: The sum of £200 was voted from 1865 to 1870 for "Salary of Irish Scribe and for Cataloguing and Printing Irish Manuscripts," and from 1871 to 1890 for "Researches in connection with Celtic Manuscripts." In the Estimates for 1890–1 and up to 1896–7 this special item was merged in a grant of £400 for "Researches into and publication of Celtic Manuscripts." Since 1897–8 the grant to the Academy has been voted as a lump sum, but the Academy have from year to year allocated a similar amount to such researches. Since the death of Mr. O'Longan in 1880 the manuscripts have been reproduced by photolithography, and the last one published was the Yellow Book of Leccan in 1895. The proceeds of the facsimiles published by the Academy have never been refunded to the Treasury. The receipts from the five volumes of "Facsimiles of National Manuscripts of Ireland," published by the Stationery Office, were, of course, paid into the Exchequer. The Academy is anxious to continue the publication of Celtic MSS. But it has full discretion as to the disposal of its grant-in-aid, and recently it has devoted its income mainly to collecting material for a Thesaurus of the Irish language, which will be a most important aid to the study of the texts themselves.

MR. DILLON: What are the researches to which this sum has been devoted during the last few years?

MR. HANBURY: To the preparation of a dictionary of the Irish language.

MR. DILLON: Will that dictionary be published before the end of next century?

[No answer was given.]

MONAGHAN ASYLUM WORKS.

MR. DALY (Monaghan, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the governors of the asylum of Monaghan demanded from the County Council of Monaghan £6,500 last week for sewerage and other works, and that the county council, not knowing of this expenditure at the asylum, struck a rate that will leave the council in debt several hundred pounds at the end of the year if they have to pay this claim of the asy-

lum governors; and whether he will inquire if this work is necessary, and provide that the governors of the asylum will in future give notice to the County Council of Monaghan before making such an outlay.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: This question appears to be founded upon a misapprehension of the facts. The governors of the asylum have not demanded a sum of £6,500 from the county council for the works referred to. The joint committee of the asylum, which includes a certain number of members of the Monaghan County Council, applied to the Local Government Board for sanction to two loans, one of £6,500 for sewerage and other works, and another of £2,500 for building a new church. Advertisements were issued by the joint committee in newspapers circulating in the district inviting any ratepayer or owner of property desirous of making a representation to the Local Government Board in connection with the proposed loans, to do so within fourteen days. No objection was received by the Board, and they have accordingly sanctioned the loans—to be repaid in thirty and forty years respectively. The proportion of the amount of the two loans of £9,000 for which the county Monaghan is liable is £3,872, the county Cavan being liable for the remainder. A printed copy of the notice of the proposal to apply for these loans was sent to every representative of the county council acting on the joint committee of management of the asylum on 14th January last, in compliance with the regulations made by the Local Government Board on the subject.

SNEEM (COUNTY KERRY) POLICE FORCE.

MR. FLAVIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the ordinary police force at Sneem, county Kerry, has been increased lately; and if so, what is the cause of the increase; whether Mr. Warden has now or had at any time lately police protecting his house; and if so, on what grounds; and whether, considering the present condition of the district of Sneem, he will make representations to have the extra police force withdrawn.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: The ordinary police force at Sneem has recently been augmented by five men to enable better protection by patrols to be given to a caretaker in the locality. Mr. Warden receives protection because such protection is considered necessary. These additional constables cannot be withdrawn until their services are no longer required.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that 50 per cent. of the tenants on this estate are excluded from the benefits of the Land Act by the recent action of this landlord?

MR. FLAVIN: And is he aware that the magistrates in petty sessions have signed a petition for the withdrawal of these men?

IRISH EDUCATION—NEW REGULATIONS.

MR. FLYNN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has seen a copy of a memorandum issued by the National Teachers Association of Ireland, in reference to certain provisions contained in the proposed new rules and regulations issued by the Commissioners of National Education, and the probable injury to the cause of primary education; and whether, in view of the fact that the extract from said rules was only issued a few days ago, the Government will delay their adoption of them for a period of about six months, in order to give the managers of schools and the school teachers an opportunity of considering their effect on the system of primary education in Ireland.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: I have not yet seen the memorandum referred to, but I had the opportunity yesterday of an interview with a deputation of Irish national teachers on the subject of the new rules. The answer to the second paragraph is in the negative; the Government have no such power, nor do I think it would be desirable to exercise it if they had.

MR. FLYNN: How long must the rules be on the Table of the House before they receive the sanction of Parliament?

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: They do not require the sanction of Parliament. They are already in force.

EXTRA SUBJECTS—REMUNERATION OF TEACHERS.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Cork County, N.E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, if he will state what is the scale of remuneration to be paid to teachers in the national schools of Ireland for extra subjects, sanctioned only out of school hours, a list of which is issued by the Commissioners of National Education.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: The scale of remuneration and mode of payment for extra branches have not yet been determined by the Commissioners.

MONITORS IN IRISH NATIONAL SCHOOLS.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether gratuities for the instruction of monitors will be paid to Irish national teachers as usual this year, and when will the result of their examination be made known to those monitors who attended the examinations held during last Easter week at the different district centres.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: Gratuities due on account of monitors' instruction for the past year will be paid to the teachers in all cases. The results of their examination at Easter will be made known to the monitors without delay.

IRISH COUNTY SURVEYORS.

MR. FLAVIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state whether county surveyors and deputy county surveyors are compelled under the Local Government (Ireland) Act to devote their whole time to the service and work of the county councils in Ireland; and, whether the office of county surveyor and deputy county surveyor are pensionable offices or otherwise.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: Existing county and assistant county surveyors hold their office on the same terms and conditions as heretofore. County councils cannot prohibit them from undertaking private practice if they are able to do so without neglecting the duties of their office. I understand, however, that since the passing of the Local Government Act, 1898, the surveyors have little or no time for private practice owing to their increased duties. In the case of new appointments there would be nothing to prevent councils from stipulating that the persons appointed should devote their entire time to their duties. The offices of county surveyor and assistant surveyor are pensionable, the former under 38 and 39 Vict., c. 56, and the latter under Section 83, Sub-section 11, of the Act of 1898. But no surveyor appointed after the passing of the Act of 1875 can obtain a superannuation allowance unless he has given his whole time to the service of the county, and assistant surveyors must also devote their whole time to the service of the county to qualify for superannuation allowance.

PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE—STANDING ORDERS.

MR. CARVELL WILLIAMS (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he can say when it is intended to consider whether any and what change should be made in Parliamentary procedure, so that notices of Motions may not prevent the House discussing questions of urgency or importance.

I also desire to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, as Members of the House generally are deprived of the opportunity of moving any Amendments in the case of Bills which are reported without Amendment by Standing Committees, he will consider the expediency of such an alteration in the mode of procedure as will secure that all Bills reported from a Standing Committee, whether amended or not, shall be considered on Report in the House.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I think the hon. Member will agree that at the present period of the session these are subjects which it is impossible for us to take up.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. TALBOT (Oxford University): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can give the assurance that an opportunity will be given for considering the Vote for the Local Government Board in Committee of Supply.

LORD HUGH CECIL: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he will state when the Local Government Board Vote will be taken.

MR. BRYCE: When will the Board of Trade Vote be taken?

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean)): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can give the House long notice of the day on which the Supplementary Vote for the war in South Africa will be proposed.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman will state the business for next Monday?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I propose to put down the Local Government Board Vote and the Board of Trade Vote on the two remaining allotted days for Supply. I cannot put them first, and whether they will be reached depends on what view the House takes of the relative importance of the questions that arise. The Army Votes are down, but they will not be put first. As to the Supplementary Vote for the war in South Africa, I hope that it will be taken to-morrow week. I am unable to give an absolutely certain answer, because my scheme has been upset by the uncertainty as to whether the Papers promised by the Colonial Secretary will be in the hands of hon. Members by Tuesday, on which day I had proposed to take the Colonial Vote. I have put down the Foreign Office Vote second. That, I think, will be a convenient arrangement, but it cannot be maintained if the promised Papers are not in the hands of hon. Members. I will defer a statement on that point until my right hon. friend can inform me on the question. On Monday the Government will take the Military Bills. I am not certain whether the Companies Bill will be down from the Grand Committee, but whether or not that is the case, I think it would be rather short notice for the Bill to be taken. The Military Lands Bill will be taken first, and afterwards the other Military Bills which were advanced a stage yesterday. I hope to put down the Naval Reserve Bill on the same day.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: What is the alternative business for Tuesday?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have not had time to consider that.

MR. WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield): Will another day be given to Army Votes?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No; they have already been discussed. I cannot put them down as first Order.

MR. FLAVIN: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can state approximately the amount of money to be asked for in the Supplementary Estimate in connection with the war in South Africa; and also approximately what portion of the estimated gross cost of the war in South Africa will Ireland have to contribute.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am not yet in a position to state what is the amount of the Estimate.

MR. FLAVIN: I will put the question again to-morrow.

SEA FISHERIES BILL.

Reported from the Select Committee, with Minutes of Evidence; Special Report brought up, and read.

Report and Special Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 287.]

Bill reported, without amendment.

COMPANIES BILL.

Reported from the Standing Committee on Trade, etc., with Amendments.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 288.]

Minutes of Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 288.]

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be considered upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 304.]

NEW BILLS.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS' SUPERANNUATION (ISLE OF MAN).

Bill to extend The Elementary School Teachers (Superannuation) Act, 1898, to Teachers serving in the Isle of Man and to service as a Teacher in that Island, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Jesse Collings and Secretary Sir Matthew White Ridley.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS' SUPERANNUATION (ISLE OF MAN) BILL.

"To extend the Elementary School Teachers (Superannuation) Act, 1898, to Teachers serving in the Isle of Man and to service as a Teacher in that Island," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 305.]

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS' SUPERANNUATION (JERSEY).

Bill to extend The Elementary School Teachers (Superannuation) Act, 1898, to Teachers serving in the Island of Jersey and to service as a Teacher in that Island, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Jesse Collings and Secretary Sir Matthew White Ridley.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS' SUPERANNUATION (JERSEY) BILL.

"To extend The Elementary School Teachers (Superannuation) Act, 1898, to Teachers serving in the Island of Jersey and to service as a Teacher in that Island," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 306.]

INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION (IRELAND) BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order for Second Reading read.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. G. W. BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): This Bill is introduced with special regard to the recommendations of the Viceregal Commission appointed to inquire into the system of intermediate education in Ireland. That Commission made a very thorough inquiry into the whole subject; it took a large amount of evidence, and ultimately brought in a valuable and unanimous Report. It is not necessary that I should describe minutely the conclusions at which it arrived, but, speaking generally, it reported in the direction of attaching less importance to individual results and more importance to tests of general efficiency as the measure of the grant that should be made to a school. How far legislation is necessary to give effect to its recommendation is a doubtful matter; on one point certainly it is requisite, and I think we may take it for granted that the Commissioners would not be willing to give effect generally to the recommendations which they made in the absence of special legislation clearly enabling them to do so. The Bill proposes to give powers of a general character to the Board—powers which will enable them to apply portions of the funds at their disposal for the promotion of secondary education in a manner provided by rules to be made by the Board with the approval of the Lord Lieutenant. It has been deliberately drafted in that form because it seemed to the Government that the provisions of Clause 2 would give sufficient safeguards against any abuse of the powers so conferred; but, in addition, it was thought desirable to give them greater freedom than they would possess if their policy was absolutely limited and circumscribed to the recommendations made in the body of the Report. I am still of opinion that the Bill in that form would be a more useful measure than one limited to the recommendations of the Committee, because it is impossible to say definitely the direction which fresh educational developments may take. Just as since 1878 considerable difference has become apparent in the opinions of those interested in education, so in the next twenty years similar differences may arise. But it has been intimated to me that in its present form the Bill might prove contentious, and that the element of contention might be removed if in the Committee stage the Government were prepared to introduce Amendments confining the scope of the Bill to the recommendations actually made by the Commissioners. In the circumstances I shall be prepared to make that concession to the objectors to the Bill, and having given that intimation I

trust that the Second Reading of the Bill will be taken without very much further discussion. The measure will constitute an important step, not only in the cause of secondary education in Ireland, but in the cause of education generally in Ireland.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. G. W. Balfour.*)

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): The circumstances under which the Bill has been brought to a Second Reading are such as will probably prevent any great contention over its provisions. A Bill dealing with this subject cannot, however, be disposed of in a few minutes; there must be some reasonable discussion of the subject. I do not think it would be possible for a more important and interesting subject connected with Ireland to be brought before the House. It is now some twenty years since the intermediate system of education was established in Ireland, and ample time has elapsed to enable the Irish people generally to judge of its merits and demerits, and, with regard to the system, the public opinion of Ireland has come to three clear conclusions. I believe that public opinion has come almost unanimously to the conclusion that, looking at the system broadly, it has worked a very great deal of good in the secondary education of the country. It has certainly put an end to the apathy and stagnation which prevailed in Irish schools twenty-five years ago. Interest in the school work has quickened, and emulation has been stimulated and improved. Boys at school work with a keener zest than they did twenty-five years ago, and the standard of secondary education has been greatly improved in every school throughout the country. Not the least valuable feature of the system is that it has enabled high-class secondary education to be imparted to the children of poorer parents—education which it was very difficult for them to obtain before the intermediate system was introduced. The Irish people under these circumstances are prepared to admit that the system has been of enormous benefit. But it is equally clear to them that this intermediate system has grave defects which have been apparent to everybody, and I say the fact that we have had to wait over twenty years for a remedy for these defects points to the most serious defect of all—the centralised and irresponsible educational control which has been set up. The Board of Education which exercises control over the education of the country consists of seven gentlemen, and although I dislike intensely alluding unnecessarily to any question of religion, I feel bound to point out that of these seven gentlemen four are Protestants and three Catholics, and it seems rather a strange thing that Protestants should preponderate on a Board which is administering education to boys the overwhelming majority of whom are Catholics. This Board is exclusively appointed by the Government, and its history for the last twenty years shows that it has been for the most part absolutely out of touch with educational opinion in Ireland. Certainly the headmasters of the schools in Ireland have had no voice whatever in the management of examinations or any other matter connected with the work of the Department. I believe it is not overstating the case to say that for the most of those twenty odd years, certainly for the last ten years, no member of the Board has had any personal experience whatever of secondary education in Ireland. I think that is a system thoroughly unsound. The gravest defect of all is that the constitution of this educational control is wrong. It is, I believe, without parallel in any country in Europe. I do not think there is another instance in Europe of an educational board of this kind which has not associated with it a consultative council, upon which the opinions of practical educationists are represented. I do not pretend to be completely familiar with the educational systems of Europe, but I do not believe that in any country there is an Education Board appointed by the Government having no association with practical education, as happens to be the case in Ireland. Even here in England—England that is always so slow to move in these matters—this Continental system was adopted last year. An Education Act was passed for England which created a consultative council, to consist, so far as two-thirds of its members were concerned, of persons qualified to represent the views of universities and other bodies interested in education. The first consultative council includes such authorities as Mr. Dyke Acland, Sir William

Anson, Mrs. Sophy Bryant, Sir William Hart Dyke, Professor Michael Foster, Professor Jebb, Mr. Ernest Gray, Professor Owens, and others. With such a precedent, surely a similar system might be extended to Ireland, and you might give us a consultative council charged with the duty of advising the Board on educational matters. We have a precedent nearer at home. I see the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the South Division of the County of Dublin in his place. Last year a measure was passed constituting the Department of which he is the head, and a provision was inserted in it for the creation of a consultative council to advise him on matters of technical education. The principle having, therefore, been adopted in England, and to a certain extent in Ireland, I submit that it should be extended to the Intermediate Education Board, as until that is done that Board will continue, as it is, I believe, to-day, to be very largely out of touch with educational opinion throughout the country. This is a reform which, for my part, I feel sure is bound to come in the very near future. This Bill, however, does not propose any reform of this character at all. As the right hon. Gentleman has most frankly stated, it, on the contrary, confers new and enlarged powers on this centralised and irresponsible Board. As it is drawn, it enormously increases the powers of the Board, and if it be passed as it stands it will give for all time to the Board of Intermediate Education, however it may be constituted in the future, absolute power to spend its endowments in any way it likes. That is a proposal which I certainly cannot agree to, neither do I believe that the Irish Members of this House will assent to it. If the constitution of the board were amended in the way I have suggested, by associating with it a consultative council, then the objection to giving enlarged powers to this Board would almost entirely disappear; but so long as the Board is constituted as at present I believe Irish representatives would be false to their duty, and false to the best interests of education in Ireland, if they agreed to pass a measure such as this, giving the Board absolute plenary powers. This Board may or may not command public confidence. Nobody can tell what its constitution in the future may be, and it certainly seems a rather startling proposition that we should be asked to give it a blank cheque to enable it to do as it likes henceforward. This Bill proposes to give power to the Board to interfere, not merely with the results of education, but also with the methods of education in every school in Ireland. The schools, in fact, will have absolutely no voice whatever, and therefore I say that in my opinion it would be a most unwise and foolish thing for the Irish representatives to give the Board power to carry out Amendments in their system of which we know nothing, and which will not be submitted for our judgment. I therefore cannot agree to the Bill passing in its present form. With its main object, however, I am in perfect accord. That object is plain. The history of this intermediate system is in many respects most curious. For upwards of twenty years public opinion has been clamouring for a change in the Education Board, and the anti-reform section of that Board, if I may so call it, has been successful in preventing any reform whatever. At last, by the exertions of some members of the Board, it was induced to ask the Lord Lieutenant for an inquiry into the present system, and the House will be amused when I recall the fact that the inquiry that the Board asked for was to be one directed by itself; in other words the Board of Intermediate Education asked that members of its own body should be appointed a Commission to inquire into the defects or the merits of the system it was administering. The Intermediate Education Commission which sat was, therefore, a Commission consisting only of members of the Board of Intermediate Education itself. The inquiry, though held under such disadvantageous circumstances, still proved most valuable. It was held in the light of day, and by the very force of circumstances the Board were obliged to examine as witnesses all those associated most closely with educational interests in Ireland, with the result that evidence was given on every part of the system, and the greatest possible light let in as to its merits on the one side, and its defects on the other. The Commission—rather to my surprise, I confess, knowing some of the elements on the Board—unanimously agreed to a Report of a most valuable character, setting forth a number of very important reforms—reforms for which people have been clamouring for a great

many years past. It would not be right for me to attempt to make this an opportunity for any prolonged consideration of the Report, but I might say in passing that I think the Government ought to give Irish Members a proper opportunity of discussing the recommendations in that Report. Those recommendations, when they become new rules under this Bill, will have to be laid upon the Table of the House for a certain number of days; but we know by experience that that does not mean a proper and adequate opportunity for discussing matters of that sort. They will come on late at night when there is no real opportunity for discussion, and I think it will be only fair if I ask the right hon. Gentleman on behalf of the Government to give us some sort of understanding that before the forty days, or whatever may be the number of days during which the rules are to lie on the Table elapse, a fair opportunity should be given for their consideration. If we have no such prospect before us I am afraid we will be driven to consider and discuss them on this Bill—a course which will be inconvenient and not in the interest of the passage of the measure. All I have to say may be summed up in two or three sentences. The chief complaint against the system of intermediate education in Ireland was that it led merely to a training of the memory, that it did not train the intellect, that it simply crammed the mind. The system of competition and the system of exclusively written examinations were very largely regarded as the causes of the deplorable results which undoubtedly have followed. I regard the first three recommendations of the Report as of enormous importance. The provision as to the two courses will enable boys to obtain the advantage of the system by training themselves more on a commercial than on a literary or a classical basis, and the first two provisions are calculated to put an end to the system of cramming, which undoubtedly has had very bad effects in the working of the system in Ireland. Equally important from this point of view is the recommendation which provides in certain cases for *viva voce* as well as written examinations, and in certain circumstances that the test of the efficiency of a school should not be solely, as heretofore, the results of the examinations, but should depend upon a certain modified inspection. These are some of the main recommendations in the Report, and it would be very foolish for anyone interested in secondary education in Ireland to throw any obstacle in the way of those recommendations being carried into effect. I must, however, take this opportunity of expressing the deep regret universally entertained in Ireland that there is nothing in the Report dealing with the study of Irish. Some years ago the marks allotted to Irish in the programme of the Intermediate Board were suddenly, and without any valid reason being given, reduced, and they are to day considerably below those awarded for French, German, or other languages. It is a monstrous thing that the language of the country, the ancient language of Ireland, should in this way be proscribed in the system of intermediate education, and that it should be on a lower level than the languages of the Continent. If it were in my power, I would be delighted to have an opportunity of moving some Amendment that would insert in the new rules which will be based on these recommendations, a provision that the marks for Irish should be raised to the standard at which they stood before, or at least be equal to those given for French or German. Let me, however, briefly sum up the position I take on this Bill. I am quite willing—I am anxious—that the Board should have given to them the necessary powers to carry out the recommendations of their own Report, and if the Bill is amended in the direction indicated by the right hon. Gentleman so as to limit these powers to carrying out those recommendations, I think it will be the duty of Irish representatives not only not to throw any obstacle in the way of this Bill, but to facilitate its passage into law. I have drafted an Amendment on this subject, which I propose to put on the Paper, and a copy of which I have handed to the Government. I do not ask for any pledge that the Government will accept the precise terms of that Amendment, but I do expect the right hon. Gentleman to give us a pledge that in Committee an Amendment carrying out the substance of my proposal will be either proposed or accepted by the Government. My suggested Amendment runs in this way—

"And so far as may be required, in order to carry into effect the several recommendations

contained in the Report of the Intermediate Education Commission presented to Parliament in 1899, may from time to time apply a portion of the funds placed at the disposal of the Board," and so on.

The Bill, as it stands, enables them in future to dispose of the money under their control in any way they like, while the Amendment I suggest limits their power to the spending of the money in the carrying out of those particular recommendations embodied in the Report, which are before us, and of which we approve. I understood the right hon. Gentleman to promise that he would accept in substance that Amendment, and on that understanding I hope the Bill will be passed into law. I may be asked why, if I take so strong a view as I have expressed about the constitution of this Board, should I agree to enlarge its powers at all? The answer is very plain. We all want the constitution of the Board altered, and I am strongly in favour of associating with it such a consultative council as exists elsewhere. But I have to ask myself—are we, therefore, to postpone all the reforms for which we have asked and waited for the last twenty years? We desire to see the recommendations of this Report carried into effect, and the only way they can be carried into effect is by passing this Bill with the alteration I have suggested. I should, therefore, on the understanding given, support the second reading, and I think it would be a wise course generally for Irish Members to take the same line, in the hope that thereby we may obtain valuable reforms in the system, and that in the constitution of the Board in future we may be able to obtain such a reform as I have indicated.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): I rise to perform once again the ungrateful task of criticising the drafting of the Bill. The hon. Gentleman opposite has told us that this Bill does not provide for the preservation of the Irish language. I think, at any rate, judging from this Bill, that the English language has become almost a dead tongue in Parliamentary drafting. The first section of the Bill begins—

"Notwithstanding anything in the Intermediate Education (Ireland) Act, 1878, or the Local Taxation (Customs and Excise) Act, 1890——"

notwithstanding anything in those two Acts—therefore, before I come to this Bill at all I have to know everything in those two Acts. Then I turn to Section 4—

"This Act may be cited as the Intermediate Education (Ireland) Act, 1900, and the Intermediate Education (Ireland) Act, 1878, the Intermediate Education (Ireland) Act, 1882, and this Act shall be construed as one Act, and may be cited collectively as the Intermediate Education (Ireland) Acts, 1878 to 1900."

Therefore I have got four Acts to read together before I can come to a knowledge of what is enacted. That is hard enough, but let me come back to the first clause—

"Notwithstanding anything in the Intermediate Education (Ireland) Act, 1878, or the Local Taxation (Customs and Excise) Act, 1890, portion of the funds——"

What portion? A small portion? A large portion? Some portion? Is there a word omitted? It must be Irish.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): If it was Irish it would be intelligible.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Certainly as it is here put in English it is not intelligible. You cannot say "portion." You can say, "*a* portion," "*some* portion," or "*any* portion." It may be adequate, but it does not appear so to me; that is all I say.

"—— portion of the funds placed at the disposal of the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland (in this Act referred to as 'the Board') may, subject to the proviso in Sub-section (4) of Section 5, and to Section 7 of the said Act of 1878——"

First of all you say, "notwithstanding anything" in that Act, and now it comes in as part of the Act. This seems to me to be another instance of that legislation by reference which has been so often condemned in this House. I do not know how the English or the Irish Attorney General would deal with such a simple matter if they had to refer to the Ten Commandments or the law against murder. I suppose he would say, "Notwithstanding anything in the 20th chapter of Exodus, the word 'wilfully' should be inserted in the 13th verse," and then I suppose he would say, "This Act shall not extend to Ireland." I sometimes ask myself whether the framers know what they have in their minds. Here is another point to which I invite

the attention of the Chief Secretary. Sub-section 2 of Clause 1 provides—

"All rules made in pursuance of this section shall be laid before both Houses of Parliament within three weeks after the same have been made, if Parliament be then sitting, or if Parliament be not then sitting, within three weeks of the session then next ensuing."

But which end of the session? Is that right? To make that passage intelligible you should follow the example set in the first part of the phrase and insert—

"Within three weeks after the commencement of the session."

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: That is the common form.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: If that is the common form, then it is not intelligible and it is not plain, and such words ought not to be put into an Act of Parliament. It is another instance of slovenly drafting, and it is neither English nor Irish. I do not think the Education Commissioners will understand this law, and certainly the man who comes down to give technical instruction will not be able to understand it. I protest against this kind of drafting, for the object of a draughtsman should be to render that which is complicated distinct and clear and that which is involved plain, so that we may all understand exactly what laws we have to obey.

MR. T. M. HEALY reminded the hon. Member for King's Lynn that the object of the drafting of a Bill was that nobody should understand it. Had it not been for the speech of the hon. Member for Waterford he should have been inclined to oppose the measure. He was perfectly sensitive of the number of absurdities that had grown up under the existing system of examinations in Ireland, especially in the teaching of modern languages. In order to obtain passes in French, pupils were instructed to pronounce the French language as it was spelt. As to "cramming," he could not see how pupils could learn anything except by cramming. The system which it was proposed to abolish had to be compared with the system which it was intended to introduce. Could any rule which could be proposed get over the question of *personnel*? The laws which were passed for Ireland were good enough until they reached the judges. The rules under this Act might be of a splendid and impartial character, but the moment they got away from the practice of this competitive system and entered upon the question of *personnel*, then came in religious and political controversy, and the schools would consider whether the inspector was a Protestant or a Catholic, whether he was a Jesuit or a member of the Nonconformist conscience. Under the system proposed to be set up they would have at once, unless the inspectors were almost on a level with the angels, a burning controversy. They had been told that for the first time they were going to have superannuation. He did not know how this superannuation would scale off all this earthly dross. Suppose they appointed as an inspector a most learned, a most pious, and the most perfect Jesuit possible to examine an Orange school—say, in Sandy Row—in the elements of Euclid. The whole of the pupils might find themselves "plucked" by the new examiner. In that case was there an organ in Belfast that would not be ready to contend that this result had ensued because a Jesuit inspector had been sent down? He would take another case. They had at the present time, earning large sums, Jesuit schools in certain parts of the country. Supposing they sent down some hard and fast examiner from the north of Ireland, with very strong theological views, to examine a Catholic school in Cork which had hitherto earned large prizes, was it supposed that they would not have the suggestion made that the inspector was a person of religious bias? He saw the other day, in a paper in the south of Ireland, where it was the custom to have an examination in the Catholic catechism, that several columns were occupied with attacks on the clergyman conducting the examination, whose fairness was called into question. That was amongst Catholics. Now it was proposed, in regard to a Board composed of four Protestants and three Catholics, to set up a system which was to give satisfaction to both sides. He would ask anybody who had considered the subject to consider the *personnel* of the examiners, even under the competitive system. Papers were set, and secretly set, and there had been no imputation whatever of unfairness, and so far as

he knew there had been no complaint whatever of the existing competitive system. But it was a strange fact that at the very moment this competitive system was instituted nearly all the examiners were Protestants. Taking the entire body of examiners who had been conducting the competitive system in Ireland for the last twenty years, it was an extraordinary thing that the learned persons set to conduct the examinations nearly all belonged to the general minority of the people in Ireland. His hon. and learned friend had mentioned the names of the members of that Commission, and undoubtedly they were all very eminent men. For his part he protested against judges of the land being appointed members of that body. Why did they not mind their own business? To tell him that a lawyer of the eminence of the Chief of the Bar had not enough to do in his own court, and that he had to fill up his leisure time and amuse himself in setting problems for the benefit of the youth, when he had problems enough to discuss in his own court, was an absurdity, and a gross absurdity. Either the judges had enough to do or they had not. If they had not enough to do, abolish them. If they had enough to do, do not go to the farce of suggesting that men of that laborious occupation could really engage themselves in business of this kind. Take Mr. Justice Mathew. He was no doubt a very distinguished Shakesperian scholar, and a very eminent man in many ways; but was it suggested that he had not enough to do on the bench, or that he ought to be supposed to occupy the Long Vacation in considering these educational problems? Had the Lord Provost of Trinity College not enough to do? The O'Conor Don was a man of leisure, a gentleman and a Catholic, and was a proper appointment from the point of view of a man having time on his hands. Then there was the Rev. Mr. Martin, of the Theological College, Belfast. He knew nothing for or against him, but he thought he should be a gentleman sufficiently employed in the Theological College. Of Mr. David G. Berkley he had never heard, and he did not know whether he came from Belfast or Bantry; and there was the Archbishop of Dublin. The majority were hostile in religion and politics to the majority of the people of Ireland. They were told that in ordinary times Ireland was a hotbed of controversy, but yet a large number of persons of a different persuasion to that of the majority of the people were appointed to these positions. He would be well disposed to have this Bill deferred to another session, and then, perhaps, in a new Parliament the Government might bring up a scheme for the entire revision of the education system. They had stood it now since 1878, and for his part he would be prepared to bear the burden for another twelve months. The final observation he had to make was that he entirely protested against this scheme. The first thing an office-seeker in Ireland wanted was a job; when he got the job he wanted an advance in salary; and when he got the advance he wanted a pension. These office-seekers were all delighted when they got the jobs, and they were perfectly satisfied; then their work became really overpowering, and they claimed an advance of salary, and when they got that they wanted a pension. Who were these gentlemen? Let their names be known. Thoms' Directory was rather vague on the subject, but he would back this: that every man who was to get a pension under the Bill was a Tory and a Protestant. That he was sure of, because there was no fear that the Government would go out of their way to give pensions to Catholics or Nationalists. The Bill, as the hon. Member for King's Lynn complained, was very vague in its drafting; but as he read it, the pension scheme would mean a further diminution of the Irish Church surplus. The Bill stated that "the Board may, if they think fit, order out of the funds at their disposal," which, of course, meant the funds out of the Local Taxation Account—which was to that extent an ear-marked Imperial Fund—and the Irish Church surplus. No burden would be placed on John Bull; he was too much engaged in South Africa and China, and of course the losses in Natal must be taken into account. Therefore, for the second time in this session, they had a raid made on the Irish Church surplus for the benefit of a particular class in Ireland. He protested against it. He thought these gentlemen had done very well out of the country. They had had very little to do in making out these examination papers. Look at all the examination papers available. There were the Home Civil Service examination paper, the examination paper

for sub-commissioners in Ireland, which he recently brought before the House, and the Indian Civil Service examination papers. The officials would only have to copy from them, and for that they were to be given pensions. There was a great deal to be said for the view of the Gaelic League and other societies of that kind—namely, to block these Bills and then insist on their own views. The Government sooner or later would give in, and, perhaps, if they would give the pensions, the Government would give marks in Irish, or something of that kind. If they promised the pensions the Government might even agree to the teaching of the Irish language, and in that way, in another session, and, perhaps, in a new Parliament, they might get what they wanted. His own view was entirely against the passing of the Bill, and he thought that it was to be regretted that the Government had not determined to bring forward a comprehensive reform of the system now in force.

MR. LECKY (Dublin University): After an exceedingly long and full inquiry, at which all creeds and classes in Ireland were heard, the members of the Intermediate Board, among whom were Archbishop Walsh and the Provost of Trinity College, came to a unanimous conclusion on this matter, and I believe that this scheme was drawn up by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin and the representatives of the Church of Ireland and the Presbyterian Church. I do not suppose that anyone imagines that the Intermediate system in Ireland is, or ever will be, a perfectly ideal one under existing conditions. In working an united system of three creeds we must look not only to questions of efficiency, but quite as much to questions of religion. We must oftentimes duplicate officials, not because they are wanted, but because they belong to different creeds. Examiners must be changed over and over again for the same reason, and under these circumstances you will never get an ideal system. All classes in Ireland are agreed that the system of payment by results, which some years ago was popular, has been carried to an extent which is extremely injurious to the best schools of Ireland, and the real point in this Bill is to substitute payment after inspection to a great extent for payment by results. The three most eminent members of the three different creeds in Ireland are all agreed that this very important change is for the benefit of the poor children for whom this intermediate system is intended, and I earnestly hope that these proposals, having been received with complete harmony in Ireland by members of different creeds, will not be obstructed or opposed by hon. Members, and that this piece of good work for Ireland may be carried into effect during the present session.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): I confess I hold what I know to be a somewhat extreme view on this question. I go so far as to differ from the hon. Member for Waterford in what he says as regards the effect that has been produced by the results system in Ireland. I am a bigot on this subject, I admit. I believe, although it is a deplorable thing to have to say, that intermediate education in Ireland is worse to-day than it was fifty years ago. I do not expect any Irishman to agree with me, but I do believe that we have been going backwards. I believe our fathers had better schools in Ireland than we have at the present time. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dublin University, whose authority on these matters is great, and who, whenever he devotes himself to a speech on education or literature, is always listened to by hon. Members on these benches with the respect and interest he deserves, drew in his speech a most melancholy picture of the state of Irish education. He seems to accept it as inevitable that Ireland should for all futurity be condemned to the miserable circumstances which have placed the education of that country in a deplorable position. He said practically that all the evils connected with education in Ireland arose from a conflict of religions and the rival claims of different persuasions. I will tell the House what has been the root, in my judgment, of the unsatisfactory position of the intermediate and every other system of education in Ireland. It is that when the Intermediate Education Act was passed in 1878 no man ever thought for a single moment of considering it from an educational point of view. The Bill was dealt with by the Government and by the House, as all Irish educational questions are dealt with, from the point of view of rival factions in Ire-

land, and still more from the point of view of the Parliamentary exigencies of the Government. I have been in this House for twenty years, and I confess I never heard Irish educational questions debated from the point of view of the interests of the people or of educational advancement. Irish education has always been dealt with from the point of view of political exigencies, and that is the reason it is so unsatisfactory. The speech of the right hon. Gentleman shows that he has abandoned all hope of ever reaching the true ideal of education in Ireland, and thinks that we must accept this barbarous system of subordinating the educational interests of the people of Ireland to political exigencies as a permanent system. The original Irish Intermediate Bill was a bad Bill, and the machinery for its administration was worse. I will give the reason for that. We see this extraordinary phenomenon, already alluded to by the hon. Member for Waterford: that for twenty years the Irish people have been absolutely powerless even to demand a reform in the system of intermediate education, because the House of Commons and the Government of the day—with great ingenuity from the point of view of their own convenience, but with infinite perverseness from an Irish educational point of view—saddled us with an irresponsible Board, and abstained from putting down a single pound on the Estimates which would have enabled us to discuss the system from year to year. The effect of that has been that we have been closured and forbidden to debate the working of the intermediate system of education in Ireland. We have succeeded in effecting very considerable improvements in primary education because, fortunately, we had on the Estimates a large Vote which we were able to discuss, and during which we laid our views before Parliament, and consequently many of our grievances were redressed. But, as regards intermediate education, the Government, warned by their experience in primary education, constructed an iron wall, by which, having passed a very bad Bill and set up a very bad Board, they have completely muzzled Irish Members from discussing the working of the system. In my opinion we never will have decent intermediate education in Ireland until we have a Minister or a Board in control of the system which will bear the same relation to the public opinion of Ireland as the English Board of Education has to public opinion in this country. We hear about the danger to the integrity of the Empire in connection with Home Rule. Was there a danger to the integrity of the Empire in allowing the Irish people to educate their own children according to their own ideas? It was part of the system pursued by this country in regard to primary, intermediate, and university education, to compel the Irish people, by taking hold of their children, to forget that they were Irishmen. In order to stamp out the obnoxious spirit of nationalism, the children were never taught the history of their own country or the history of their language and literature. Although that policy had been laid aside, and men are now ashamed to admit that it had ever been put in force, yet the old principles on which the system of education in Ireland was first started still live. I want to know on what grounds this House denies to Ireland the right to educate her own children according to the views of the people of that country, just as you allow the education system of England to be cast and recast according to popular sentiment in England. Am I to be told that the union of the Empire and the interests and integrity of the Empire demand this sacrifice at our hands? I doubt very much whether any Minister will get up at this time of day and say so. The Chief Secretary of the Colonies cannot say that, because we all remember that in the "unauthorised programme" which was to be the alternative to Home Rule he proposed deliberately that the whole system of education in Ireland should be handed over to an Irish Board. That would be a true system; and we would settle this matter among ourselves. I maintain that all these religious quarrels which are alleged as an excuse for the infamies which have destroyed education in Ireland are the creation of your interference in Ireland, and it is intolerable that you should attempt to justify the ruin of our educational interests by such flimsy pleas. Leave us to ourselves, give us a free hand, and in twenty years we will show a very different picture from now. It is impossible to conceive a question more vitally affecting the future generations of our race than that of education, and yet when a Bill is introduced regarding it, hon. Members

who are qualified—none better—to appreciate the real ideals on this matter, get up from these benches and, with gloomy countenance and in a melancholy voice, accept as the unchangeable fate of Ireland that the education of our children must be subordinated to vile politics. It is time for us to put forward a claim on this matter of education which you have so dismally failed to make a success, and that you should give it up to some Irish body which would be responsible to the people of Ireland. My position is that this is largely a question of personality, and we shall never have a satisfactory system of intermediate education in Ireland, nor of primary education, until we have a Board which will be responsible to Irish public opinion. There is only one other point on which I wish to say a few words, and that is as to the teaching of the Irish language and literature. The hon. Member for Waterford said quite correctly that unfortunately in the Report of the Commission, which is a very able Report in certain respects, there is no mention of the teaching of the Irish language. That was not because the Commission did not investigate the subject. They heard a great deal of evidence upon it. The preservation of the old records and the ancient literature of Ireland is a matter of interest to practically all the scholars of Europe. The witnesses who came before the Commission gave most interesting and valuable evidence which struck me very much, although I confess I have been for twenty-five years a member of all these national scientific associations, and was indeed one of the founders of the Association for the Preservation of the Irish Language. But when Professor Atkinson came before the Commission he gave evidence of the most scandalous kind. Although the Chief Secretary smiles, I repeat it was evidence which shocked and disgusted the German and French scholars who take an interest in this matter; and in fact it attracted a great deal of attention throughout Europe. This gentleman, who enjoys the hospitality of Ireland and rejoices in the receipt of a large salary, comes forward and declares that the Irish language and literature are worthless objects of study, that it is impossible to teach the Irish language in the schools of Ireland, because its literature is so disgusting and filthy that he would be ashamed to allow anybody to read it. Now I am sorry to say that, although this subject was so fully investigated, there is no recommendation in the Report in regard to the teaching of the Irish language. If my memory serves me rightly, it was placed long ago among the paying subjects in the schools.

*MR. SPEAKER: I fail to see how the hon. Member can enter into a general discussion of the teaching of the Irish langauge and literature under this Bill. Of course I understand that regulations are to be made by the Board, and it is possible that the question may arise under these regulations. It is competent for the hon. Member to suggest that from what he has seen in the Report the Board of Education in Ireland should not be entrusted with that power; but to raise the question of the Irish language and literature generally is going too far.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Would it not be in order to move, as an Amendment, that no Bill will be satisfactory to the Irish people which does not provide for the efficient teaching of the Irish language?

*MR. SPEAKER: I think that would not be in order. This Bill is for the creation of a Board which is to make regulations in connection with intermediate education.

MR. DILLON: I think if you, Mr. Speaker, will allow me a few moments, on a point of order, I may make some effect on your mind.

*MR. SPEAKER: I should have said that this is a Bill for entrusting an existing Board with power to make certain regulations.

MR. DILLON: The Bill is to endow the Board with very great additional powers which will revolutionise the whole system of intermediate education in Ireland. It seems to me to be at the root of the question that the Bill be read a second time, whether the Irish people have sufficient faith in the Board to justify its being entrusted with such powers. The object of granting these powers is to carry into effect the recom-

mendations of the Board in its own Report, and it seems to me that we would be clearly in order in discussing the nature of the recommendations, because there is no object in introducing the Bill except to carry out these recommendations.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is entitled to advance arguments to show that the Board ought not to be entrusted with larger powers, but he is going far beyond that. It is irregular to anticipate what the regulations as to teaching Irish may turn out to be, and so to discuss the teaching of the Irish language as if it were the substantial question before the House.

MR. DILLON: The point which I was trying to address to the House was this. In the past history of the Board they started by putting the Irish language upon the same level as French and German. It is a permissive subject, and that is the policy of the Board. There is no compulsion for any child coming into an Irish school to learn the Irish tongue.

*MR. SPEAKER: I think the hon. Member is going beyond the scope of the Bill.

MR. DILLON: Then I fail to see what we are to discuss on this Bill, and I shall be much obliged if the Chief Secretary or somebody else will explain to us. This is a Bill to give large powers to the Board. If we are not entitled to criticise the Board or to discuss the uses which they have made of the powers that they already have, how are we to discuss the question at all? Am I not allowed to go into the history and tell the House the uses they have made of those powers they already have?

*MR. SPEAKER: I have said that the hon. Member is entitled to show that the Board ought not to be entrusted with large powers, but the hon. Member is not entitled, because there is a particular subject with which the Board will have to deal in the regulations, to treat that subject as a topic for general discussion upon this Bill.

MR. DILLON: Then I will say that this Board has placed the Irish language upon the plane of French and German—that is to say, on the plane of a foreign tongue; and I think upon that ground we are not justified in trusting the Board in future. I now turn to one point arising out of it which, I think, is strictly in order. This Bill proposes, I think, in Clause 2 a certain method by which the Board is to exercise its power. There is nothing in the Bill laying down the conditions under which intermediate education is to be conducted in Ireland in future, but it is perfectly obvious that the object of the Bill is to place in the hands of the Board the power to alter in the most radical manner the whole system of intermediate education in Ireland. I am in hearty sympathy with the resolution, but I think I am entitled to examine the machinery that is to carry this into effect. The Bill prescribes that it should be effected by rules which shall lie on the Table of the House for forty days. I say that the system of education under these new rules will be illusory and absurd, and early next session—for the rules will not be out this session—we ought to get a pledge that a day will be given to discuss the new rules, when all these matters, which are vital to our people, ought to be fairly and fully discussed. I will put the matter a little further, and I would ask the Government to make this departure: I would ask them to place upon the Estimates some Vote—I care not how small, £50 or £100 a year—by way of a grant-in-aid towards this matter, so that in future we may, from year to year, have a right to discuss the system of intermediate education in Ireland, as we now have a right to discuss primary education. I think that is only reasonable, as it is governed by a Board over which we have no control, and upon which the people of Ireland are only represented by a small minority.

MR. RENTOUL (Down, E.) thought that when the hon. Gentleman described himself as a bigot on this Bill he was hardly doing himself justice. In all probability his (Mr. Rentoul's) medical education led him to take a view upon the subject which would not be taken by

those who had not given the same study to medical science. While the Commission was sitting to inquire into this matter, a medical man of great eminence wrote to a large number of his professional brethren in Belfast and Dublin upon the question, and received from all a reply which spoke in terms of the terrible evil that was done to intermediate education in Ireland. Those letters were far more important to his mind than any evidence that was given before the Commission, and why they were not published in any newspaper he did not know. It was from the medical point of view that this Bill ought to be considered, and therefore he could not agree with the first of the three propositions laid down by the hon. Member for Waterford. The hon. Member said that the system of intermediate education that had been in vogue since 1879 had done marked good. No doubt the hon. Gentleman spoke from his own experience; but let hon. Gentlemen compare their experience with his. The hon. Gentleman's first remark was that boys work with greater assiduity; that he emphatically and entirely denied. In the schools before 1879—before this system of intermediate education was started—the assiduity of the boys was just as great as at the present time. He had been a pupil at four Irish schools, and had once had opportunities of being in many in connection with prize distributions, and he had taken a great interest in this subject. Bribery with regard to education—and he regarded these prizes and scholarships as bribery—had been rampant in Ireland since 1879. It was simple bribery and prostituting education, and dragging it down from the high level on which it ought to stand. The cultivation of the intellect ought to stand next in importance to the cultivation of the soul, though it required a greater metaphysician than himself to say where the one ended and the other began, and he almost despaired when bribery and fraud were so rampant. They might almost as well offer bribes to people to attend to their religious duties. The hon. Member then said that the standard of education had been raised, and there, again, his experience did not coincide with that of the hon. Gentleman. As a test he would point out that the intermediate schools, both before and since 1879, had been preparing students for the university colleges, but, so far as he could hear, the standard of examination necessary to obtain a scholarship in the three Queen's colleges had not improved. The standard of education had not been improved at all. If the standard had been raised in the intermediate schools, clearly the standard in the university colleges must have risen too. Some hon. Gentlemen only smiled, and that was because they did not approve of the Queen's colleges, but that had nothing to do with the question. The point was that so long as students came into the colleges from these schools the colleges were the test of the work done in the schools. He found on looking over the list that Queen's College, Galway, had the honour of having more Members in that House than any other university college in the United Kingdom except Christ Church, Oxford, and that being so the scholarships of that college would certainly be the test in the matter. Then the hon. and learned Gentleman said that education by this intermediate system was being extended to the poor. Again he would ask the hon. and learned Gentleman, before he repeated that statement, to investigate and find out whether there were more students now going on to university education than before 1879—whether, in fact, the number had increased, and whether intermediate education had done anything in that direction. The hon. and learned Member had said that the system had many grave defects. There he agreed with him at once. He listened with great attention and took great pains to hear what the many defects were, in order to treasure them as the result of the hon. and learned Member's experience of the subject. As far as he could gather, the hon. and learned Member stopped with one of the grave defects, and that was with reference to the seven gentlemen who formed the Board. The grave defect there, in the hon. and learned Gentleman's mind, seemed to be that four members were Protestants and three were Catholics.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: That is a most unfair statement. I only alluded to the constitution of the Board in passing. The real defect in the constitution of the Board to which I drew attention was that it was irresponsible and had not associated with it, as have other similar

Boards elsewhere, anything in the nature of a consultative council.

MR. RENTOUL said he should be extremely sorry to say anything unfair to the hon. and learned Member, but that was how the matter struck him. He did not gather any other objection. He now came to the recommendations of the Commission, and he might refer just in a sentence in passing to the question of teaching the Irish language. He thought that instead of letting children waste their time in learning Irish it would be better to let them learn French and German, or something that would do them some good. As for the statement that the teaching of Irish was desirable on account of its necessity in the investigation of old documents, surely it was rather trifling with a serious debate to put such an argument forward. There were not three of the Irish Members in that House who, in addressing their constituents, could speak fifteen words of Irish. [Several HON. MEMBERS: It is not true.] Hon. Members said the statement was not true. He always liked things to be brought at once to the test. His test was this. Let hon. Members representing Irish constituencies who did speak the Irish language write letters to the newspapers in the Irish language contradicting the statement. A statement of that sort made across the floor of the House did not mean much, and recoiled upon the gentlemen who made it. He recalled to the recollection of hon. Members the statement made only a few weeks ago by the Lord Chief Justice as to the inutility of trying to learn the Irish language. As regarded the Commission, one recommendation was certainly of extreme value. He referred to the recommendation with regard to having a modern school course and a grammar school course. The hon. Member for North Louth had said he did not see very much objection to cramming. He could not help thinking that the hon. Member must attach a different meaning to the word from that which was usual. The word education meant the drawing out of the mental powers, but cramming was the very opposite. What did they mean by cramming as understood technically in schools? They meant that educational pills were prepared, and that they were swallowed. A portion of history was taken, and a few questions were drawn up and tabulated with the answers. The pupils, without understanding the bearing of the matter at all, had to commit these questions and answers to memory. They knew that was the way preparation was done by cramming. The same thing applied to languages. In connection with Latin or Greek, for example, certain catch words, very odd forms of expression, were picked out. They were of very little value to the scholar, but they were generally picked out as catches, and put down in the examination paper. Reference was made in the debate by the hon. and learned Member to the system of teaching and examining in modern languages. Anything more futile than that system of teaching could not be imagined. It was a fact that the pupils were not allowed to pronounce the word at all, lest the attempt to pronounce the word should have an evil effect on their spelling. That was cramming. He advised the hon. and learned Member to look into the meaning of the word cramming. It was a word which was perfectly well-known in the educational world. When a tutor was being employed at present to prepare a pupil privately for the intermediate course he had known the question asked, "Is he a good crammer?" They all knew that cramming was a means of stunting and dwarfing the intellect. If any one wanted to encourage cramming there was no better means by which it could be done than by the intermediate system as it had existed hitherto. Many Irishmen considered that it would have been better if not a single farthing had been spent on intermediate education since 1879, and that a vast number of shattered constitutions and early graves were the result of the system. Now a change was to be made, but it was impossible to say whether it would be one atom better. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dublin University said the rules would be made by very able men. But they did not know what the rules would be. It was said that a Report would be laid on the Table, and that they would have time to consider and discuss the rules. They might be discussed after twelve o'clock, and, of course, if the discussion took place then there was no possibility of teaching the constituencies.

on one of the most important Bills which had been before this Parliament. To say that the members of the Board were well meaning, conscientious men who would do their best and so forth, did not meet the case. No doubt the Government of 1879 were most anxious to leave on the Statute-book an Act that they themselves would feel credit in afterwards; but it seemed to him that the Act was worse than useless. There was nothing more deplorable in education than to be perpetually changing the system. They must give a plant time to grow before they pulled it up by the roots. He was not in favour of the proposal presented by the Bill; he would rather see the question postponed, or the Commissioners allowed to exercise whatever powers they now possessed at their discretion without the Bill, than that the whole matter should be shelved, as it would be if this Bill was passed, for a very considerable time. The hon. Member for East Mayo had, as usual, made use of the Bill to make some reference to Home Rule. It was, however, rather unfortunate that he did not look more carefully at the result of his argument. He said:—"Why is not this matter left to the Irish and the different denominations? Leave the Irish to manage their own affairs." But that was exactly what was done by the Intermediate Board. ["No."] The Board was composed of seven gentlemen, every one of whom was Irish.

MR. DILLON: Nominated by Dublin Castle.

MR. RENTOUL: What does that matter? They were seven men of great distinction, and what did it matter if they were nominated by Dublin Castle, so long as the right men were nominated? If there had been a Home Rule Parliament in Dublin they would in all probability have nominated these very men. There was not one of them who could possibly have been objectionable to such a Parliament.

MR. DILLON explained that his point was, that whoever was nominated or elected should be responsible to a body representing the people.

MR. RENTOUL: This Intermediate Education Board is responsible to this House. ["No."] Then what does this Bill mean?

MR. DILLON: It is not responsible. Ask the Chief Secretary.

MR. RENTOUL contended that if the House had power to disestablish the Board at any moment, to take away its emoluments, and to change its functions, surely the Board must be responsible to the House. The hon. Member for East Mayo was therefore only weakening his argument by bringing in Home Rule by such a side wind. It would be fair enough to say that these seven gentlemen, having acted on a system for twenty years, had become more or less wedded to that system——

MR. DILLON: I am sorry to interrupt, but I do not want to be misrepresented as to my attitude towards these gentlemen. These gentlemen have acted on a system imposed upon them by this House. They are not wedded to that system, because they are now seeking power to depart from it. The hon. and learned Gentleman is therefore misrepresenting me in this matter. What I was trying to bring out were the evil results of not having some administrative body conducting the education of the country responsible to public opinion in Ireland.

MR. RENTOUL would not willingly misrepresent the hon. Member, but that was how he understood his argument. The position taken by the hon. Member for Waterford in support of the Bill was not one in which he would be backed by the public generally. The question was whether this large grant of money was well or ill spent. Opinion upon that subject varied along a considerable line. Some people held that the Intermediate Grant had been the greatest educational curse of any land or age. That was one extreme. The other was that the grant had been the greatest possible boon to the people of Ireland. Moderate people, however, who had studied the matter had come to the conclusion that the grant as at

present administered was of no value to the country, and that a complete and drastic change was needed. The question was, would that change be made by the Report which would be laid on the Table? And if it was not, would there be any opportunity in which the matter could be fully discussed, so that something might be done which would be of permanent value to the country?

*SERJEANT HEMPHILL (Tyrone, N.): I shall not detain the House at any length, but I must express my agreement with one observation, and only one, of the hon. and learned Member for North Louth. I believe this is one of the most important Bills that has been introduced by the present Government or could be introduced by any Government. It is a Bill which will materially affect the education of the youth of Ireland of every class and denomination; and anything that controls and affects the education of the youth of a country determines more than anything else can do the future destiny of that country. I have been a close observer of the working of the Intermediate Education Act, living as I have done in Ireland all my life, and being brought into contact with youths who took advantage of the Act and with youths who were educated before the intermediate system came into operation. The result of my experience is that the Intermediate Education Act was, on the whole, a benefit to Ireland. It was not an unmixed boon, but it was very far from being an unmixed evil. I cannot agree with those who think the general education in Ireland has not progressed under the influence of the Intermediate Education Act; but in saying that I am far from contending that the system is not capable of very great improvement. I may say in passing that it is perfectly vain to expect that youths can be stimulated to a great amount of work and exertion unless some species of prize or inducement is held out to them. There may be individuals of such very superior temperament and constitution as under the ideal of the celebrated Dr. Arnold might enter the arena of study and reach the goal without any material inducement being held out to them. But such are the few and the exception, and we must legislate for the average of human nature. This applies not merely to youths, but also to men in every stage of life. The majority of mankind are striving for garters, stars, ribbons, or decorations, and they undergo great risks and perils in the anxious struggle. I have often heard it said with regard to examinations of all sorts, "Oh, what a desperate system cramming is!" Cramming may be abused, but cramming really is nothing but devoting yourself night and day to certain subjects of study which are set before you. Afterwards, when you are subjected to examination, the result of that toil and labour comes forth, and the industrious boy is singled out from the idle boy.

MR. RENTOUL: That is not what cramming means.

*SERJEANT HEMPHILL: We will not dispute about words. I do not understand cramming to mean anything drawn out of a man, nor do I understand education to mean anything drawn out of a man. If that were so, what would be the use of education, the object of education being to improve the intellect and the *morale* which are essentially bound up in the man? But to come to the Bill itself. After the speech of the hon. Member for Waterford I should be very sorry indeed to throw any difficulty in the way of the Second Reading, but whether the Bill will be a good or a bad Bill depends altogether upon the rules which are made under it. I myself would have preferred that it was postponed; I would like to have seen it brought in as a part of a great scheme regulating the entire system of the education of Ireland. The whole system requires overhauling. This is only a step towards reaching a system of education which is so much wanted in Ireland, and on which the prosperity of the country so much depends. If the rules are framed in such a way as to hold out equal advantages to all classes of the community, and if the House has a proper opportunity for discussing and amending those rules, I see in this Bill the nucleus of what may turn out to be a very useful measure, and in that view I shall support the Second Reading.

MR. CLANCY (Dublin County, N.): The hon. and learned Member for East Down said that he did not know what

rules were going to be made by the Commissioners if this Bill passed. If I was in a similar state of ignorance I would vote against the Second Reading of the measure; but I wish to state in the presence of the Government what I understand to be the actual state of the case. The Bill in its present form would enable the Intermediate Board to make any rules they liked at any time in relation to the duties they have to perform. To that proposition I offer the strongest possible opposition. The hon. Member for Waterford stated, however, that the Government had agreed to accept an Amendment limiting the power of the Commissioners to make rules on the lines of the recommendations contained in their Report. That being so, we are not in ignorance of what the Commissioners are going to do. We may not know exactly what they are going to do, but we do know the main lines upon which their work will proceed. If I am wrong in that, I will vote against the Second Reading, but otherwise I shall vote for it. I have no hesitation in saying that if any rule is made contravening the general recommendations of the Report it will be a breach of faith on the part of the Government and of the Commissioners. If, however, as the right hon. Gentleman has indicated, it will be absolutely illegal to make any rules contrary to those recommendations, I have the strongest reason for supporting the Bill, because I approve of those recommendations. I think there is no difference of opinion on that point. Nobody, except the hon. and learned Member for North Louth, and the right hon. and learned Gentleman who has just spoken, has defended cramming, and I am not sure that either of those two Gentlemen would defend cramming properly understood.

*SERJEANT HEMPHILL: I do not defend cramming. I gave a definition of what I understood cramming to mean.

MR. CLANCY: The right hon. and learned Gentleman does not defend the system by which at present subjects of comparatively little use are taught, and he does not defend the physical injuries resulting from overwork in connection with examinations. Nobody in the House defends those things, and the recommendations of the Report go to remedy those defects, and when I know that the Bill will simply enable those recommendations to be carried out I have no hesitation in supporting the Second Reading.

SIR JAMES HASLETT (Belfast, N.) cordially agreed with nearly all that had been said by the hon. Member for Waterford, understanding that all that was intended was to give the Board power to carry out the unanimous recommendations of the excellent Commission that took so much evidence in connection with intermediate education. He looked with a certain amount of fear upon the tremendous power put into the hands of the inspectors to say whether or not the quality of the teaching given by a particular teacher was efficient. He freely admitted that if any consultative system could be married to the existing system, if the Commissioners could come down more immediately to the parties who were to be educated, if they could see more to the detail of the work, if they could appreciate the difficulties of the teachers and thoroughly understand the educational work from that point of view, a very great advance would be made, and he hoped the day was not very far distant when that would be done, and there would be a union or fusion between the governing body of the Education Department in Dublin and the general working body in the particular districts. He was deeply interested in the vexed question of the Irish language. He was in favour of it being taught, but it must be subsidiary to the language which would enable the youth of the country to compete in the struggle of life. Care must be taken that the education given did not in any way interfere with the broadening of the horizon of the youth of the country. By teaching them Irish only, the sphere of their labour would be circumscribed; but if the language were taught as Latin was taught—as a means of understanding the records of the country and the beauties of its literature—it was desirable that every Irishman should have a smattering of his own language. Higher marks, however, must not be given for Irish, and lower marks for Euclid or for French or German——

*MR. SPEAKER drew the attention of the hon. Member to the fact that he was now getting into a discussion of the merits of the Irish language.

SIR JAMES HASLETT thereupon concluded his remarks by saying that he supported the Bill, believing that the rules to be made would be rules to carry out the unanimous recommendations of one of the best Commissions which had ever sat upon this question in Ireland. As the Bill merely empowered the Board to give effect to those recommendations, he thought it was a measure which should receive the sanction of the House.

MR. HARRINGTON (Dublin, Harbour): While I quite agree that the promised acceptance of the suggested Amendment of my hon. friend has completely changed our attitude towards this Bill, I think it is nevertheless our duty to protest against this system of treating so important a question as the education of the Irish people by a Bill which on its face really discloses none of its main features, as such a measure should do under the circumstances. It is a very deplorable thing that when a Bill was being introduced the rules in accordance with the Report should not have been presented to the House. I also agree with the hon. Member for East Down that it is much to be regretted that we should enter upon a system of education as an experiment, and that after a year or two the whole system should be completely changed again. As the whole value of the Bill depends upon the rules which will be made under it, it is an extraordinary thing that we are precluded from considering those rules in the present debate, and that we should be precluded in all future debates from considering this entire question of the system of education in Ireland. This Bill enables the Commissioners to do a certain thing, and but for the Amendment of the hon. Member for Waterford, which has been accepted, we should have been hopelessly in the dark, and we should have had no future opportunity of reviewing the system set up by the new rules. I quite agree in the general condemnation of the system of intermediate education as practised up to the present time, but I must confess that I cannot go to the whole extent of entirely condemning the result system. I believe a judicious system should combine both the stimulus to the individual pupil and the stimulus to the efficiency of the school as a whole. I could not go at all with the hon. Member for East Down in condemning as demoralising the giving of prizes as a stimulus to study. I think the hon. Member has gone too far, and I do hope that, in the rules which are to be adopted, the general efficiency of the schools will be very carefully considered, while at the same time means should be found of inducing individual pupils to strike out to obtain those marks of distinction which, after all, have not been injurious to the result system. I think when this House gives its approval to these new rules we should have the full means of ascertaining whether the measure is suitable to the country or not; and though I am prepared to support the Second Reading upon the promise which has been given, I do protest against the system of introducing a complete change in the system in the manner which has been adopted, for it commits the House to rules without our knowing exactly what those rules are.

MR. POWER (Waterford, E.): I think it is very unfortunate that these rules were not presented along with the Bill. I understand that the Government, while not in a po sition to state the exact rules, have pledged themselves that the money shall be laid out on the main lines of the recommendations of the Commission, and that promise meets our view. I think, however, that it is scandalous that we are asked to pass a Bill of this importance in this way. We hope an ample opportunity will be given by the Government to discuss this question, not after midnight, but at a proper and reasonable hour. As far as educational matters in Ireland are concerned, owing to the way in which the Irish Estimates are arranged, we never have an opportunity of discussing the educational policy of the Government. In my district I may say that the gravest disappointment will be evinced at the way in which this subject has been dealt with.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): I have no intention of delaying the House, but it appears to me that a subject of this importance deserves the serious

attention of the House of Commons. The education of the people is really the most important subject that could engage the attention of the legislature at the present time. What do we see when we look around to other countries, such as the United States, Germany, or France, or any other great legislative bodies? Can any Member of this House imagine that a subject of this importance would be brought in by such a skeleton Bill, pledging us to principles of this kind, in any of the Parliaments in the countries I have alluded to? I am not going to enter into detail, but as an Irish Member I protest against this system, for it is not treating a great subject with that attention which it deserves. This question of intermediate education is one which requires immense care and debate by trained educationists. To expect a Bill like this to be accepted practically without debate is not treating respectfully this great subject of education. I think the Bill ought to contain something more than the carrying out of the recommendations of this Commission. The National Board of Education should not be constituted as it is at present, for it is really an irresponsible nominated Board with extraordinary and extensive powers of expending money which is contributed by the ratepayers, who have no control whatever over that expenditure. As a taxpayer and as a representative of the city of Dublin, I object entirely to that principle. I say that the people should have some control over the Board of National Education, who really govern the whole system of education in Ireland. It may be alleged that the House of Commons has a certain control over this expenditure. I deny that, because, owing to the way the Votes are taken for national education, the question does not come within our purview. We have no opportunity whatever given us of controlling the actions of these gentlemen, and the result is that we have a system of so-called national education which is anti-Irish, and which omits to teach the principal thing which an Irishman ought to know. The Irish language is not taught, and I have been requested to ask that Irish should be taught in every national school, and more particularly in the southern districts of Ireland, where the Irish language is still partially spoken. I cannot understand why the Commission omitted any reference to a matter upon which there is such a large amount of popular feeling at the present time, and I trust the right hon. Gentleman will give us some gleam of hope that this matter will receive attention. I am prepared to vote for the Second Reading, but I do so very unwillingly. I say that the manner in which education in Ireland has been carried out is exceedingly unsatisfactory, and we have no definite guarantee as to what improvement is going to take place except the recommendations of the Committee. These recommendations do not satisfy me, for I think the Irish people ought to have some control over the National Board of Education, and the people should have some control over the funds which they provide. They have neither control nor influence under this Bill, and in this respect it is very unsatisfactory. I have no intention of further delaying the House except to appeal to the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill to give a favourable answer to the request which has been put forward in regard to the teaching of the Irish language. The present system of intermediate education in Ireland has done much harm to the rising generation, because, instead of being given a useful education, they have been taught something which has not enabled them to obtain employment, and the system has been manufacturing an article for which there was no demand. Manual instruction has been altogether neglected, and undoubtedly the results have not been satisfactory. I have no faith in the system of cramming. There was no intermediate system where I was educated, but there was cramming, and I confess the result was that I forgot all about the subject in a very few weeks. The system of cramming is altogether wrong. There is one other matter which to my mind is a very serious defect. Under the present system the smart children are taken out of certain schools and placed in better schools, and I think that is a wrong system. I think every boy and girl ought to get equality of treatment. I trust the right hon. Gentleman will give some expression of opinion as to the constitution of this Board of National Education, which I trust will be made responsible to somebody, for at present they are responsible to nobody. I hope that an opportunity will be given to the House to discuss and debate these rules

so that we may know exactly what system of education is to be introduced in Ireland in the future. Our educational system means either the ruin or the prosperity of the country, for education is the main factor in progress, and a more important thing could not be discussed in this House. The question is non-political and non-sectarian, and every man must be affected by the intellectual progress of the community amongst whom he resides.

MR. J. F. X. O'BRIEN (Cork) said that the refusal of the Government and the Education Commissioners to give to Ireland the bilingual system which had been given to Wales was an infamous conspiracy against the Irish language. The Government and the Commissioners appeared to have as much terror of the Irish language as they would have if Mauser Rifles were to be placed in the hands of the people.

MR. SHEE (Waterford, W.): In regard to the Amendment which the Government have agreed to accept, I think it will be very necessary for us to first get the assent of the Government to the suggestion made by the hon. Member for East Mayo in reference to the desirability of giving the House an opportunity of discussing the rules, although they are restricted to the recommendations made by the Commissioners. There is one very important pecuniary question which may arise in regard to the rules which are to be made. Under the system which has hitherto existed the amount given to masters of schools and colleges for results has averaged £50,000 a year, while the amount given to students as prizes has been something less than £18,000 a year. It should be quite possible in making the rules to reduce to a much smaller proportion than £18,000 the amount devoted to prizes for competitors in the class examinations which it is proposed to substitute. I altogether disagree with the right hon. Gentleman in his view that intermediate system has resulted in cramming, because anyone who knows the nature of the questions set in examination papers could not possibly make this mistake, for those questions could not be answered effectively by anybody who had been crammed. The effect of cramming depends upon the kind of question the examiner puts, and examiners can to a great extent prevent or mitigate the existence of the evils of cramming by the nature of the questions they set. I think it would be a great misfortune for intermediate education if the annual grant which has hitherto been given in prizes should be reduced. Undoubtedly it is not the amount of these fees which have been given to the masters of colleges that has produced the success in the system, but it is the amount given to the pupils which has induced them to pay more attention to their studies than they did under the old system of education which existed in Ireland before the Intermediate Education Act was passed. I believe the result of increased grants to the masters would have a tendency to increase cramming, for it would then be to the advantage of the masters to prepare a certain number of pupils, and so prepare them that they would get as the result of the examination a very large proportion of the result fees. The recommendations of the Committee will prevent the adoption of a general pass examination and the possibility of cramming. There is another question which has been mentioned as one of the evils of the intermediate system. I believe that there is real ground for the assertion that there has been over pressure, which is a different thing to cramming. Over-pressure has existed to a very great extent in the intermediate schools, and the result has been that a great many pupils have been practically ruined in sight and in other ways. Possibly the new system will to some extent diminish this over-pressure. I think the Government ought to consent to the suggestion made by the hon. Member for East Mayo that when the rules have been drafted and laid on the Table of the House we should be given an opportunity of discussing them, because it is possible, with the very wide discretion the Commissioners possess, that they may make rules which would be very objectionable to the people mostly interested in the system. For that reason I think the House ought to have an opportunity of discussing the rules. It is also very desirable that every year the House should have an opportunity upon the Estimates of discussing the question of intermediate education, and of dealing, for the public benefit, with the manner in which the Commissioners carry out

their duties under the Intermediate Education Act.

MR. MURNAGHAN (Tyrone, Mid) said he wished to know whether the superannuation proposed in Clause 3 was to come out of the Irish Church Fund or out of the money set aside for the benefit of intermediate education in Ireland.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR : From the Intermediate Education Fund.

MR. MURNAGHAN : Then you are diverting the money set aside by this House for education, and you are handing it over to a certain class of officials. This money was granted for a special purpose, and you are devoting it now for a purpose entirely different. That is not a matter which Members of this House ought to pass. The amount of money for encouraging intermediate education is small enough already, and for this House to take away any large portion of that amount would be a very unfortunate matter. I think the Government might find a sum somewhere else instead of putting their hands upon the fund at the disposal of the Intermediate Commissioners. I have heard a great deal about cramming, but I do not know what is meant. If you do not hold out some promise of a reward to students for their industry and perseverance, they will not apply themselves so much to their studies. I hope the Commissioners will not believe that the majority of the Irish people are opposed to any efforts they may make to encourage pupils to put themselves to the test and bring out to the very full their mental capabilities. I have no sympathy at all with the remarks which have been made upon this question of cramming. I think, however, that this proposal is running in a wrong direction, for it is diverting the money which should be given to those who apply themselves to study, and the money should be used as a stimulus in this direction. I think it is unfortunate that this Fund should be cut into by the Government in order to grant annuities to these officials. I think the Government might very well let the Fund stand for the purposes for which it was intended, and that they should have taken the money for these pensions from some other source.

Question put and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed for Monday next.

IRISH EDUCATION BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order for Second Reading read.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR : This second Bill dealing with education in Ireland has been introduced in order to facilitate the carrying out of a reorganised scheme for the payment of teachers which has been already adopted by the Commissioners of Education, and which is embodied in the Blue-book laid on the Table of the House the other day. Over three-fourths of the sum available for the payment of teachers in Ireland the Commissioners at present have the right of free disposal. It is only as regards a sum of about £250,000 that the Commissioners are in any way limited as to the manner in which it should be distributed. The effect of this Bill, if passed, will be to give the Commissioners the same free hand over the distribution of this £250,000 as they already have over the remaining three-fourths of the total sum available for the payment of teachers. When I introduced this Bill I said that it was not absolutely necessary for the purpose of carrying out the new scheme that the Bill should be passed. Perhaps I ought to explain a little more in detail what I meant by that statement. The payments which the teachers will receive under the schedule will in every case include all the remuneration they now receive. Their present incomes will, as a matter of fact, be covered by the consolidated salaries paid to them under the provisions of this Bill, and the reorganised scheme could have been carried out from a legal point of view without this Bill at all. It may be asked, then, why we have decided to introduce it. One reason is that it is desirable to have this Bill on the Statute-book, because, although it is not necessary for the purposes of the scheme, yet it will remove certain difficulties which, although they do not amount to legal obstacles, it is desirable should be removed. It may be

frankly admitted that the schedule did not contemplate consolidated salaries to the teachers, and, therefore, it is just as well that this Bill should be put on the Statute-book. But there is another and more practical reason why this Bill should be passed. Unless it is passed, the Commissioners may be called upon by any teacher to show that, as a matter of fact, the consolidated salary to be paid to him covers the remuneration he now receives. There would be no difficulty in proving that in every case the necessary conditions have been fulfilled, but it would impose a very considerable amount of labour indeed on the staff of the Commissioners. I understand that the Synod of the Church of Ireland have raised certain objections to this Bill, on the ground that it will take away some of the advantages which small schools now possess. In my opinion, and in the judgment of the Commissioners, that view is absolutely unfounded. It is admitted that small schools, having from ten to nineteen pupils, will undoubtedly benefit pecuniarily under the scheme, and I think also that schools having from twenty to twenty-five pupils will also benefit pecuniarily. It is perhaps right that I should call attention to the fact that the Commissioners have not yet published the salaries of the different grades, because a great deal of calculation is required before the salaries can be finally fixed; but I may safely say that the consolidated salaries will cover every part of the teachers' present remuneration, and if the Bill is passed there is absolutely no fear of any injustice being done, or that any teacher in any small school will suffer under the new rules. But, as I have already stated, the Bill is not absolutely necessary for the scheme of the Commissioners, and if there is a disposition on both sides of the House that the Bill should not be insisted on I will give way to that pressure, because the Leader of the House has already stated that it is not our intention to press any of these Irish Bills if they are opposed.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

*Mr. SPEAKER: This will be a convenient time to inform the hon. Member for Waterford that the Amendment on the Paper in his name, by which he proposes to raise the question of the teaching of the Irish language in elementary schools, is not in order. The Bill proposes merely to abrogate the rules under which the distribution of grants-in-aid is now made, and to authorise new rules for that purpose, and any Amendment raising discussion as to the subjects or methods of education would be out of order.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: After your ruling, Sir, it is impossible for me to discuss on this motion the question I was most anxious to raise—namely, the teaching of the Irish language in these schools in Ireland. I must only bow to your ruling, Sir, and postpone that question until to-morrow, when we will have the Education Vote before us. That topic of discussion having been taken away from me, I do not propose to detain the House. The right hon. Gentleman has stated that in his opinion this Bill is not absolutely necessary, and that if it were so desired by the Irish Members he would have no objection to postponing it. I have had no opportunity of gathering the opinion of the Irish Members on the subject, but I do not think that I am very far wrong in interpreting them to be in favour of the postponement of this Bill. We take a very strong view of the action of the Government in not affording us an opportunity of discussing the system of new primary education in Ireland. It is true we may discuss it to-morrow, but one sitting is quite insufficient for the discussion of the question of the Irish language and also for the discussion of this elaborate system. We feel very strongly that we have not been properly treated by the Government in this matter, and as we are practically prevented from discussing the details of the scheme, I, for my part, think the best course would be to let the Bill stand over. If necessary, let it be introduced next year, when we will be in a better position to understand the working of the new system. For these reasons I will move the adjournment of the debate.

*Mr. SPEAKER: If the Government propose, as is suggested, to adopt the view of the hon. Member, the better course would be to move that the Order be dis-

charged and the Bill withdrawn. That ought to come from the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill.

MR. DILLON: Before the right hon. Gentleman answers, I should like, Sir, to be perfectly clear as to the scope of your ruling. You will see that it has a bearing on the question raised by the hon. Member for Waterford. I understood you, Sir, as well as I could catch your last ruling, to state that it was not within our power to discuss the methods of education in Ireland. Therefore, if this Bill were introduced next year we should be debarred from discussing any of the new rules. The object of this Bill is to put it within the power of the Commissioners to alter the whole system of education in Ireland.

*MR. SPEAKER: Not to alter the subjects of education, but the distribution of the funds.

MR. DILLON: I am not prepared to argue that the Bill directly concerns particular subjects, but it does absolutely concern the methods of education, because the sole and only object of the Bill is to enable revolutionary changes to be carried out with reference to national education in Ireland.

*MR. SPEAKER: It is not a Bill on which the methods or subjects of education can be discussed.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): Our difficulty is this. I asked a question this afternoon, and I was nonchalantly informed that my inquiry was useless, and that it was impossible to discuss the rules and regulations because they were already in operation. Then what is the necessity for the Bill? Our position is exceedingly difficult, and it would be far better if the Bill were postponed.

MR. DILLON: On the question of the Second Reading, and before the Chief Secretary states whether he will withdraw the Bill or not, I assume I will be in order in discussing the points mentioned by the right hon. Gentleman in introducing this Bill. His first point was of great importance. He stated that unless this Bill were passed any teacher could call on the National Board to prove that the sums to which he was entitled under the old scheme were covered by the gross sum under the new scheme. Therefore one effect of this Bill would be to deprive National teachers of their right under the law to call on the Commissioners to prove that their allocation of salary was accurate. If the Bill passes they will be deprived of that right. I dare say that the new system will be a better system, and that no teacher will really suffer. But that is not the view of the teachers themselves, and I do not think it is unnatural that they should be anxious, when the old system is to be revolutionised, and that they should be unwilling to part with any right they have until they see the actual figures of the new scheme. We know perfectly well that, on the admission of the Treasury themselves, the teachers were by a miscalculation deprived of large arrears, some of which we subsequently got by repeated debates in this House. Anyone who listened to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman must have realised that the subject is one of great complexity, and it is therefore not at all wonderful that the teachers should be uneasy and unwilling to part with the rights they have until they are satisfied that they will not be damaged by the provisions of the new scheme. As I understood the speech of the right hon. Gentleman, he stated categorically that the teachers, if this Bill were passed, would lose the right of calling on the Board to prove that their salaries had not been reduced. I think the hon. Member for Waterford is most wise in calling on the Government to postpone this Bill until we have time to study and consider the figures and details of the new scheme. While I take that view, I think it is only just to state—and I know I am speaking the mind of the hon. Member for Waterford and other Irish Members—that we recognise in this new scheme and these new rules for intermediate education in Ireland a development of a new spirit of educational reform. I regard it as a result of the appointment to the Board of certain individuals whose names I need not mention, and who have brought a new and a better spirit into the Board. We are heartily in sympathy with the main principles of these changes, and while there is no dispute as to principle, I think it is only fair we should take up this attitude in order to safeguard the in-

terests of the teachers and preserve their rights. After your ruling, Sir, it is manifest that this Bill will afford no foothold for discussing the general methods or subjects of education in Ireland. Next session we shall only be able to examine the financial aspects of these changes as they affect the salaries of the teachers, and there we shall be stopped. For these reasons I think the Government ought to give us an opportunity early next session of discussing both the intermediate system and these revolutionary changes. I think we are entitled to make that demand. We have been cut down to three days for Irish Estimates, and it may be next July before they will be reached, and the new system will then be in operation for more than a year. I would respectfully urge the Government that we should be afforded an opportunity for discussing these matters early next session.

MR. LECKY: I think it would be much better to postpone this measure to another session. There is a great deal of difference of opinion on the subject. I myself am not prepared to endorse altogether the views of the Chief Secretary, and I think that under the circumstances it would be very much better if the Bill were not pressed forward.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: After the views which have been expressed on both sides it must be clear that the best course would be to withdraw the Bill and bring it in later, when the operations of the new rules will be better known.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I hope the right hon. Gentleman will give some answer as regards facilities for discussing this matter next session.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: It is impossible for me to answer that question. I recognise the extreme importance of the changes we are about to introduce into both the intermediate and elementary systems of education, and, personally, I should not be adverse to a day being given for a discussion of the whole question, but of course it must be clearly understood that I am not in a position to give any undertaking on that point without consulting my colleagues. I beg to move, That the Order be discharged and the Bill withdrawn.

Motion for Second Reading, by leave, withdrawn.

Bill withdrawn.

AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS BILL.

[THIRD READING.]

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

MR. BUCHANAN (Aberdeenshire, E.): Before we pass the Third Reading of this Bill I should like to make a few observations regarding it. It has yet to pass through another place, and many Amendments may be made in it which at any rate will not be against the interests of the landlords, but taking the Bill as we find it I should like to say a few words on it. First of all, how far does this Bill really remedy the acknowledged grievances of agricultural tenants in England and Scotland, and how far is it a proper redemption of the many promises and pledges given by the Government and their supporters at the last General Election and other times with regard to this subject? To deal with the second question first, I think I am within the mark in saying that the passage of this Bill is a very long-deferred and very inadequate redemption of the promises and pledges given by hon. Gentlemen and right hon. Gentlemen opposite on this subject. It will be in the recollection of hon. Members who sat in the last Parliament that there was no subject more frequently brought forward by the Conservative Opposition than the interests of agriculture and the grievances of agricultural tenants. In every session during the last Parliament an Amendment to the Address was moved by a leading member of the Conservative party, and not content with that, the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for South-east Essex moved the adjournment of the House on this subject. All these Amendments were supported by Gentlemen then on the Front Opposition Bench, and no one was more strenuous

in supporting them than the present President of the Board of Agriculture. The General Election came, and what was the position then? If there was one subject on which the Unionist party harped, it was the neglect of the agricultural interest, and that the only remedy for this was to look to the Unionist party. I do not want to hold the Government too closely to the promises of the right hon. the Colonial Secretary, although he is a very important member of the present Government. The promises he gave on various political and other subjects were so diverse and varied that it would be unwise to place too much reliance on them; but I would like to remind the House what he did say, not when in an irresponsible position, but when he was an important member of the Ministry. On 22nd July, 1895, in the middle of the General Election, he went down and addressed a large meeting in Warwickshire, when he stated that if the Unionists were returned to power they were prepared to give a scheme of land purchase to the agricultural tenants in England and Scotland. But from that day to this not a single word has been said in favour of that proposal, and not a single step has been taken by Her Majesty's Government in that direction. When Parliament met we reminded them of their promises, and they were very indignant. Now I am justified in stating that up to that time the Unionist party themselves considered that this was a question highly important and deserving the attention of the Government at an early date. What happened? On the first day of the session of 1896 the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Agriculture gave notice from the Table of the intention of the Government to introduce a Bill to give compensation to agricultural tenants. That session passed, as did the sessions of 1897, 1898, and 1899; but it was not until the present year that the Government took any effective steps to redeem the large and wide promises they had made. And in what form did they redeem them? I think their own estimate of this Bill now is very different from the estimate they had of the importance of the subject in 1896. Instead of introducing it in the last session of the present Parliament as a measure of the first importance, they brought it in under the Ten Minutes Rule; they sent it upstairs to a Grand Committee, where it was discussed for a couple of sittings ten days ago; and now, with the thermometer standing at ninety degrees in the shade, we are expected to deal with the Third Reading. That does not look as if the supporters of the Bill attached supreme importance to it, or as if they believed that it in any sense provides an adequate remedy for the grievances of the agricultural tenants. It has been stated more than once by the President of the Board of Agriculture that, after all, this Bill will only deal with 5 per cent. of the cases of compensation that arise. I do not think a Bill is of much importance which only deals with one in forty of the grievances of agricultural tenants. It was described on the Second Reading by the hon. Member for one of the Divisions of Hampshire, a strong supporter of the Government, as "a small amending Bill"; and another hon. Gentleman opposite described it as "as good a Bill as could be got under the circumstances"; while the other night a no less strong supporter of the Government said of it that "if not totally unnecessary it was certainly harmless." Now, these are not descriptions by hon. Members on this side of the House, but by either the authors of the Bill or the most strenuous supporters of the Government and their policy. Does the Bill really make any serious attempt to settle the grievances that have existed among the agricultural tenants? It will be in the memory of all that the President of the Board of Agriculture, when introducing the Bill, and before we had seen it, described it as a Bill that would settle once for all the differences between the owners and occupiers of land. When we had the opportunity of examining and discussing it in detail, we saw how very wide of the mark indeed and exaggerated that description was. I want to state to the House what were the general proposals for the amendment of the Agricultural Holdings Act which were put forward by leading agriculturists, and what are the actual proposals in the Bill. I have here one of the most valuable Reports made by the sub-commissioners. Mr. James Hope, a supporter of the Government, dealing with various counties in Scotland, summarises the principal Amendments on which he said opinion was unanimous which should be made in the Agricultural Holdings Act.

It will be found that, at the outside, not more than two or three of these Amendments have been inserted in this Bill. But if hon. Gentlemen care to take a more simple method of testing the value of the Bill, they have only got to compare the schedules in the Bill with the schedules in the Agricultural Holdings Act of 1883. They will see that the alterations are very infinitesimal, and substantially, so far as that part of the Bill is concerned, it deals very inadequately with large and important grievances undoubtedly felt by the agricultural community throughout the country. One of the recommendations held out to us in regard to the Bill was that it would very largely simplify and cheapen procedure under the Agricultural Holdings Act, and it was said: "Here, at any rate, you will have your cases decided by a single arbitrator, and no longer by two arbitrators and an umpire, which has caused so much expense in the old procedure." When, in Committee, I endeavoured to have the Bill amended so that the procedure should really be by a single arbitrator, I was told by the Attorney General that my proposal was far too drastic, and that we ought not to make a single arbitrator compulsory. I have never got any explanation irom the Attorney General or the President of the Board of Agriculture as to how the procedure under this Bill is to be cheaper and simpler than under the existing Act. The actual proposals in the Bill are very inadequate to deal with existing grievances. It is, in fact, a very incomplete and insufficient measure. I venture to say that it does not deal with the grievances of large classes of tenants; and however applicable it may be to some classes of tenants in England, it is entirely inadequate to deal with the grievances of agriculturists in Scotland, while it is singularly inapplicable to the agricultural conditions of Wales, as will be shown by-and-by by Members from Wales. Meantime I will only deal with it as it affects my own country. When the Bill was considered on the Report stage I was constantly told by the President of the Board of Agriculture, in answer to my complaints, "Oh! that is only the case of Scotland. I cannot profess to know the actual conditions of Scotland." That was considered a sufficient answer to the arguments which my colleagues and I brought forward to show that the Bill would not adequately meet the demand of Scottish tenants. I have often heard before that "There are hills beyond Pentland, and lands beyond Forth," but we would have been perfectly content to cut out from this Bill the hills beyond Pentland and the lands beyond Forth. What we complain of is, that you have endeavoured to include in one common Bill for England and Scotland subjects which have hitherto been invariably treated by separate Bills, in order to meet the separate demands and separate conditions of agriculture. The hon. Member for King's Lynn talked about legislation by reference, but I do not know any Scottish agriculturist, and not many Scottish lawyers, who would be able to understand this Bill at first sight. But our substantial grievance is that you are endeavouring to deal here, in a single Act, not merely with purely agricultural questions, but with questions affecting the tenure of land, which are entirely different in Scotland and England. More than that, we pointed out—and nobody knows this better than the Attorney General—that there were large classes of tenants, particularly in the north-east of Scotland, who would be absolutely excluded by the terms of the schedule from getting any compensation for the substantial improvements they have made on their holdings. These are the small improving tenants called squatters. Now the First Lord of the Treasury, in the summer of 1895, speaking about what he considered to be the obligations of his party to bring forward an adequate measure of compensation, gave a very specific promise that any such measure would be applicable to small as well as large tenants in all three countries. It would affect, he said, small men as well as big men. The Government have conspicuously failed to bring forward a measure that is able to satisfy the demands of these small tenants for whom the First Lord of the Treasury pleaded in 1895, and they will for another term of years be shut out from obtaining any measure of relief. It is on these grounds of the conspicuous failure to redeem often repeated and most specific pledges given by responsible Members of the Government; of the valuelessness of the Bill to give to industrious and enterprising tenants the assurance of compensation if they put their capital into the soil, and because it will delay remedial legislation

for years, that I beg leave to move that this Bill be read a second time this day three months.

DR. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, W.) seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Mr. Buchanan.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, S.E.): The hon. Gentleman seemed surprised that we should have attacked the late Liberal Government for their neglect of the agricultural interest. But what did they do for that interest when they were in office five years ago? The hon. Gentleman is quite right in saying that I once had the honour of moving the adjournment of the House in connection with the neglect of the Liberal Government to deal with the grievances of agricultural tenants; but the debate lasted hardly an hour, when it was closured by the hon. Gentleman's leaders. The hon. Gentleman the Minister of Agriculture in the Liberal Ministry did not know the difference between barley and oats, and when a deputation of farmers came to him he practically refused to see them. Then, in the end, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouthshire introduced the death duties, which were to quench the smoking flax; and he was prompted to get up about once a month and thank God that wheat was selling at 19s. 6d. a quarter. Well, we are now taunted with not tackling the Government because they have not done more for us during the present Parliament; but we have got some concessions from the Government, and we hope the Government will do better when in office in the next Parliament. With reference to this particular Bill, as an agricultural Member representing a very large division, which extends from within sixteen miles of Whitechapel Church to the North Sea, I cannot help thanking the Government for what they have done. They have carried out the recommendations of the Central Chamber of Agriculture in 1894; they have practically abolished the law of distress except in the case of the previous twelve months rent; they have taken the question of permanent pasture, which is a burning question, from Part 1 to Part 3 of the Schedule; they have simplified procedure; they have knocked off the shackles from the agricultural industry; and have so legislated that tenants will more willingly put their capital into the land than before. I have said before that this Bill is not perfect; but very few things in this world are perfect. The attitude taken up by a good many of us in reference to this Bill is "What we can get we take." I took particular care not to move any Amendment, and not to speak often, but of course that does not mean that I thought the Bill absolutely perfect. I could have made some suggestions to the right hon. Gentleman with reference to the Bill which it might have been well to have carried out. I think a man should be allowed to cultivate the soil as he likes, so long as its fertility is not impaired; that there should be no penal rents unless actual damage is proved; and that there should be compensation for continuous good farming. I congratulate the Government on having had the courage to resist certain Amendments made by some of their own supporters, especially that proposed by the hon. Member for Newark, which alluded to the inherent capabilities of the soil. The Government very properly resisted that Amendment. If they had not done so they would have made the Bill ridiculous, and would have caused great dissatisfaction in the eastern counties, which I know well. If the inherent capabilities of the soil are high a man pays a high rent, if they are low he pays a low rent, and therefore, practically, there is nothing in it. I hope that in a future Parliament the right hon. Gentleman the Minister for Agriculture will, from this side of the Table or the other, introduce a Bill to carry out the suggestions I have made. For the rest I can only say I am extremely glad that the Government have brought in this Bill. I do not say that it will be accepted with effusive gratitude, because effusive gratitude is proverbially not a quality of the agricultural interest; but I know it is a good step in the right direction.

*MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): I regret the absence of the Minister for Agriculture, who, I believe,

is too ill to conduct this Bill through its last stage in this House. We will miss the right hon. Gentleman, for he is a master of the subject. If I may be pardoned by the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down, I think that if, instead of going into ancient history and what had been done in the last Parliament, he had read the Bill more carefully his speech would have been more valuable. He stated that the law of distraint for rent had been practically abolished. Why, it is not in the Bill. When an Amendment was moved to abolish distraint I am rather afraid that it did not receive the support of the hon. Gentleman. I cannot but express the disappointment which I feel, and which has been voiced in the country, that this Bill is not more complete and effective. There is not the slightest doubt that the farming interest expected a Bill which would give them larger rights to compensation at the end of a tenancy. It makes confusion worse confounded; for any farmer who wants to know his rights under the Bill, must provide himself with a small arsenal of Acts of Parliament. We know that farmers do not, and will not provide themselves with all these Acts of Parliament; and instead of being able to know exactly how they stand, they will have to go to expert valuers, and pay them for information, which ought to have been made clear in the Act itself. A second complaint which I have to make is that the Bill does not sufficiently strengthen the agricultural tenant. I may congratulate the Agricultural Department on having exercised considerable ingenuity in drawing up a Bill of fourteen clauses, which practically does so very little. It is a Bill fairly pretentious in size, but what it does is almost absolutely nil. A change of front always takes place by hon. Gentlemen opposite, according to whether they are in or out of office. I noticed the Minister of Agriculture, speaking at a rent-audit of the Duke of Portland, said that the less legislation there was for agriculturists the better it would be for them. That was not the cry we heard at the last General Election. I think, however, he has impressed his views on this Bill, because it does so very little for agriculturists. There are two good things in the Bill. It gives the farmer compensation for laying down permanent pasture; and the arbitration clauses are good. But, unfortunately, these arbitration clauses are vitiated by the poison that runs through the whole Bill—the power given to the landlord to contract himself out of the measure. We know perfectly well that the Act of 1875 was passed with contracting-out clauses, and that immediately every landlord sent notice to his tenants, saying he would not come under the Act. I do not want in the least to discourage agreements between landlord and tenant, provided the agreements are fair to the tenant. What we want is that we shall have an Act of Parliament upon which the tenant can fall back when he has not got a fair agreement. That is what we do not get in this Bill. The arbitration clauses are very good indeed, but they are vitiated by the fact that the landlord can contract himself out of them. I can quite understand that a landlord does not like to have to pay compensation at the end of a tenancy, and I know this, that the result of this contracting out will be that the tenants will be deterred from sending claims in; because if they go to arbitration and there is an appeal it runs up the costs, and that is a matter which affects the farmer more than the landlord, because the landlord has the longest purse. We are told that the tenant farmers will not sign agreements that are unfair to themselves; the only answer I have to that is that they do. It has been brought out before the Royal Commission, and has been publicly exposed in the press over and over again, that tenants sign impossible agreements in order to get into a farm. The object of this Bill is to protect the farmers from signing unfair agreements, and if they are able to protect themselves there is no reason for this Bill. But the Government recognises that the tenant farmers cannot protect themselves, and therefore have introduced this Bill for their protection. I shall be told, I suppose, that instead of farmers running after the landlords it is the landlords who run after the farmers. That may be so in some cases, but it is not so in the west of England, and the very fact that there are six or eight tenants after a farm compels the tenant to sign an agreement which is prejudicial to himself in order to get into the farm. What we want is that the tenant farmers shall have compensation when they quit their holdings for improvements they have made. There is the question of permanent pasture. I never could under-

stand why the tenant should have to get the consent of the landlord in order to be compensated for permanent pasture. It is well known that when a man lays down permanent pasture he cannot injure the land; that was brought out in the evidence before the Royal Commission, because if he lays it down for a certain time a considerable amount of fertility is generated in the land which can be got out by subsequent cropping. A man might lay down permanent pasture and not succeed—it depends upon the weather and many other circumstances; but if he does succeed and adds to the value of the land, why should not he be compensated for the improvement? All I say is that you add value to the land when you lay down permanent pasture, and it should not be necessary to get the consent of the landlord in the matter, because it is impossible that the landlord could be impoverished. And if you add to the value of the land I do not see why you should not be paid for it. When does temporary pasture become permanent pasture I do not, I confess, understand. I have land which has been put down to temporary pasture, and which, having been well manured and looked after, has become very good pasture indeed. Is that to be taken as temporary or permanent pasture? There is no regulation laid down. Why should compensation be given for temporary and not for permanent pasture? That is a matter which is absolutely beyond me. Then there is the question of compensation for disturbance. I know this is a debated subject, but personally, in the interests of the smaller tenants, I advocate it. It is all very well to say that large farmers can take care of themselves and that the landlords usually act very generously to their tenants; but it is the small tenants who cannot get their grievances taken up in the local press and ventilated. It is they who have to suffer in silence, and if they offend the agent of the estate upon which they are in any way they get notice to quit, and have to go into a new neighbourhood and acquire all the experience necessary to carry on farming operations in the neighbourhood, and that is only done at a great loss and a great sacrifice. I am not, of course, speaking of honourable landlords—this Bill is not intended for good landlords, but for those who treat their tenants unjustly. The claim for compensation by the tenant is to be lodged before the determination of the tenancy, but if the landlord has a claim for dilapidations, he need not claim for six years after the determination of the tenancy. That is a constant source of complaint, and the witnesses before the Royal Commission were almost unanimous in advocating that the claims both of the landlord and the tenant, should be put in on the same day. Under the Agricultural Act of 1883 the landlord is allowed to see the tenant's claim before putting in his own, with the consequence that very often exaggerated claims on the part of the landlord are put in. Upon this point I would like to quote some evidence given in favour of the claims of the landlord and tenant being delivered simultaneously. Mr. Clare Sewell Read, whose authority to speak upon this point no one will challenge, says—

> "Where the tenant has made a claim the landlord has made a bigger counterclaim. This in consequence of the landlord having time to consider the tenant's claim. I am sure it would be diminished by the claims being made simultaneously."

And Mr. Lipscombe, the Chairman of the Committee of the Central Chamber of Agriculture, which was appointed to draw up a new Agricultural Bill, says that that was a universal complaint, and that the Committee appointed to examine into the question was almost unanimous in recommending that the two claims should be put in on the same day. We ask the Government to accept that. In Grand Committee it was proposed by the hon. Member for North Hampshire, and we want to know whose views the Government propose to carry out in this matter. Do they propose to carry out the views of the tenant farmer or of people who have no interest in, and less knowledge of, the matter? It is a matter upon which the tenant farmers feel very strongly indeed. There seems to be an alarming dread in this House of giving powers to strengthen the position of the tenant farmer. It was only the other day that we had a revolt from below the gangway, because the Government proposed to allow the tenant to plant an acre of osiers without the consent of the landlord. Then certain noble supporters of the Government woke up to the fact that that was an infringement of the freedom of contract between landlord and tenant. We have been interfering with freedom of contract all through this

Parliament; we did so when we passed an Act for compensation for injuries for the labourer, and why should not the landlord be bound to pay compensation for improvements made by the tenant? It seems to me that when they come to deal with the landlords the Government have a special tenderness for their supporters. This is a matter of extreme importance to farmers. I have had cases come before me of men who had been farming for a number of years, and by skill and experience and good husbandry they have greatly improved the land; yet when they leave, all the improvement goes into the pocket of the landlord. Why should that be? Those facts cannot be disputed. I can bring cases where that has occurred, and where that has taken place this Bill will do nothing to protect the man who has laid out his money in this respect, and ensure compensation for good farming and increasing the value of the holding for the incoming tenant. We do not ask that the tenant should be paid for work which does not add to the value of the land; but if improvements have added to the value of the holding, then he ought to be compensated. I regret that the Government have not accepted many of the Amendments which were proposed to make the Bill more effective and simple; but although the Bill is ineffective and complicated, it does some little good. [Ministerial cheers.] Yes, but it cannot be said to give us even half a loaf. It gives us a crumb of bread, and that being so, I cannot support my friend in voting against the Third Reading; though, at the same time, I cannot congratulate the Government upon the measure which they have brought in.

MR. STRUTT (Essex, Maldon): There is one blemish in the Bill which I think the Government might rectify very well—that is its incomprehensibility. It is almost impossible for any ordinary layman from reading this Bill by itself to understand in any way what the law is. The people whose interests are affected by this Bill are not lawyers, and I think if the Government would give us a promise to bring in a Bill to codify these matters dealing with tenant right they would confer a great boon on the tenant-farmer class. They could easily bring in a Bill to join all these matters together in one simple measure which would be easily understood, and which would not refer to any other measure, but would contain in itself everything necessary to enable the farmer or landlord to understand what the law is. The Bill as it stands contains the terrible blemish of making it necessary for a tenant farmer when he wants to find out what the law is to go to a lawyer. I hope, therefore, the Attorney General will give us a promise that the Government intend in a future session—as early a session as possible—to bring in a Bill to codify the law relating to the important questions of tenant right.

MR. ALFRED THOMAS (Glamorganshire, E.) said that, in intervening in the present debate he wished it to be understood that it was not done for the purpose of wrecking the Bill, for as far as it goes the measure pointed in the right direction. Still less was it intended by way of a complaint against the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill, in whom we recognised not only an able administrator but one also who, we believe, sympathises very deeply with the difficult and arduous position of the tenant farmer. Our object in intervening in the present debate is to emphasise our feelings of disappointment that the Government, in drafting the Bill, totally ignored the recommendations of the unanimous Report of the Welsh Land Commission. After the treatment offered by the Government to other Reports of two different Royal Commissions, perhaps we were a little sanguine to expect to be treated differently, and though he could not often commend them on their consistency, he could with much propriety with regard to their equality of treatment of the two Royal Commissions appointed by themselves as well as that of the one appointed by Mr. Gladstone. But, Sir, something should be said for the unfortunate individual who serves on Royal Commissions. Take the case of one who sat on the Welsh Land Commission. The Commission commenced its labours in April, 1893, and ended in December, 1895, some two years and nine months. They held about ninety meetings, and examined many hundreds of witnesses, and wrote out two elaborate and exhaustive Reports. With what result? To be simply ignored.

Now what self-respecting man would care to sit on a Royal Commission if, after giving some three years of his valuable (or otherwise) time to the public, his labours should be treated with so much contempt as to be beneath the notice of the Government? But, Sir, if the Government think so little or nothing of the recommendations of three such distinguished men as Lord Kenyon, the hon. Baronet the Member for Swansea, and Mr. Frederic Seebohm, the people of Wales think very highly of them. The two former as representing the best type of landlord in the Principality and the latter as undoubtedly the greatest authority on land tenure in the United Kingdom, perhaps in the world. It is not to be expected that the name of Mr. Seebohm is a household word among the mass of the tenant farmers of Wales, though his face must be familiar to many of them—those who appeared before the Commission, which held meetings in every important centre in the Principality. And not a few, he had no doubt, had read some of the many works he had written, especially one dealing with the Principality—"The Tribal System in Wales." But the other two gentlemen are well known, Lord Kenyon in the north and the hon. Baronet in the south, and both highly esteemed and respected, and all three ardent supporters of the present Government. In reading the Report signed by those three gentlemen one is reminded of a long chapter in the Book of Lamentations. Undoubtedly they felt they held a very undignified position that they should simply represent three fingerposts pointing to the direction their bolder and more enterprising colleagues had travelled and left them out of sight. Especially so must it have been to the author of the "Land Question." Though he said that those gentlemen had only pointed the way that should be traversed, at the same time, in justice to them, it should be stated that they only differed in degree and not in principle from their colleagues. It is true they used other terms.

> "What's in a name? that which we call a rose
> By any other name would smell as sweet."

Now, Sir, let us examine some two or three of the recommendations of those gentlemen. In their Report they seem much concerned that they should not be understood as advocating what is known as "Fixity of Tenure." Yet in dealing with the question of "Notice to Quit" they say—

> "We are also of opinion that whenever a notice to quit is given it should state the reason why it is given, and that whenever the reason is other than a breach of the legal conditions of tenancy it would be fair that, in recognition of the cost to the tenant of an enforced change of tenancy, a longer notice should be required than in a case where the tenant is in default, or else that in such a case the rent should be made to cease in respect of the last year of the tenancy."

Then they say that in case of a tenant who has performed all conditions under which he holds his tenancy he should be compensated for disturbance. They say that the rent of the last year of his tenancy should be forfeited A very moderate proposal, but it has in it more than the germ of the principle of fixity. No doubt bolder reformers would say five or seven years. It is only a question of degree, and not of principle. Again, in the case of the "Sale of an Estate," they say—

> "On the whole, in a case in which it is necessary to choose between the interest of the selling landlord, who naturally desires to obtain the highest price attainable for his property, and the interest of often a considerable number of tenants to whom it is more or less a question financially of life or death, we are disposed to think the law ought to lean on the side of the weaker party. And we are disposed to suggest that the equity of the case would be more than reasonably met by the provision that in case of the death of an estate owner or the sale of the estate the tenant shall be protected by law in the occupation of his farm at the old rent for say three years from the date of death or sale, except in case of non-payment of rent or the infringement of the conditions of the tenancy, which under the circumstances of the case should be stringent enough to protect the landlord from the depreciation or exhaustion of the farm."

Here again, in their meek and mild way, they are advocating the principle of fixity of tenure, and in doing so they deserve every encouragement, as they are on the right line. For it is only by securing to the tenant who faithfully performs the conditions of his tenancy practically fixity of tenure, can we ever hope to see a satisfactory settlement of the "Land Question." Another bogey that frightened our three friends was the proposal of the majority of the Commissioners to set up a Land Court. To this, among other things, they say—

> "We would suggest that if on an estate there should be what may roughly be described as a general dispute between landlords and

tenants tending to disturbance or public scandal or manifest injustice, both the landlord on the one hand and a certain portion of the tenants on the other hand, under proper restrictions and upon an engagement to pay a certain maximum fee, should have the right to call in to their aid an expert from the Board of Agriculture or some other recognised authority to act as mediator, with a view, if possible, to bring about a friendly settlement."

Again, they advocate a new principle in the relation of landlord and tenant, and while they view with horror a properly constituted land court, yet they suggest the appointment of a go-between to settle disputes between landlords and tenants, who is to be awarded a maximum fee. While fully realising that we could not hope to settle so old and great a question as that of the relationship of landlord and tenant by the very mild proposals of those three gentlemen, we at the same time admit that there is some ground for the statement they make on the last paragraph of their Report—

"It is believed that were the law regarding year-to-year tenancy amended as we ventured to suggest a great step would be gained towards the removal of the feeling of insecurity and of other causes of dissatisfaction between landlords and tenants, without unduly infringing upon the principle of freedom of contract and without destroying the great advantages which, on the whole, and in spite of defects, the present agricultural system affords to the various classes of the Welsh people whose living is connected with the land."

Their words prove that they had properly estimated the gravity of the situation when they said—

"A great step would be gained towards the removal of the feeling of dissatisfaction between landlords and tenants."

Still they say it was only a step—though a great step. That is an admission that what they proposed was not sufficient, and could not settle the question. Though they only proposed a step in the direction of the solution of this great question, it was more than the Government would take in the interests of the Welsh tenant farmers. There is no class in the community so helpless and defenceless as the tenant farmer. Even the agricultural labourer has his association to defend him. But the poor tenant farmer is left unprotected to any and every oppression. While we know and rejoice in the fact that there are landlords who treat their tenants as well as ever they would be treated under any legislation, we know they are but comparatively few. What we want is to bring the other landlords up to their level, and no Government which neglects the rights of the tenant farmers can be said to be doing its duty to the State in leaving the most important class in the community without safeguarding legislation.

*Mr. GILES (Cambridgeshire, Wisbech): I should like to call attention to the fact that whatever this Bill does is in the interest of the tenant farmer, and that it does nothing for the landlord with the exception of the small advantage in Clause 5. With regard to the criticism that this is not a Consolidation Bill, and that it would be a very great advantage to tenant farmers to have a Consolidation Bill, all I have to say is that no doubt Consolidation Bills are extremely convenient to lawyers and to those who, having no knowledge of the subject, desire to study it. But the farmers, of whom I have had experience, undoubtedly have some knowledge of the subject, and they certainly do not rely for their knowledge upon the Agricultural Holdings Acts or any Bill, whether Consolidation or otherwise. They invariably go to some text-book for an explanation of the various provisions. I do not desire to say anything against Consolidation Acts, but it is not a fair criticism upon this Bill, which is in itself a satisfactory measure, to say that it is not to the full extent a Consolidation Bill. The hon. Member for South Molton found fault with the Government for not passing a simple Bill giving powers independent of contract. I desire to point out in the interests of many, especially small farmers, that there is another side to that question. I may give an illustration, some of the facts of which came under my personal knowledge, in the case of a farmer, a self-made man, and without capital. He had great experience of farming, and when he found the rent he was forced to pay was too much for him he went to another part of the county and took another farm. He was enabled to take that farm because of his reputation as a farmer, and he got it on this sort of consideration. The landlord said: "If you will take this farm at a yearly rental and require no compensation from me when you leave, the rent shall be so

much per acre; but if you require compensation I must forestall that possibility by charging you so much more per acre." Under these circumstances a contract was made—in my opinion very much to the benefit of the tenant farmer, who, being a man without capital, was thus enabled to take this farm and work it to the satisfaction of the landlord, and by means of the condition which he made he had to pay only a moderate rent—a rent very much below that which he would have had to pay had he insisted on all the terms of the Agricultural Holdings Act. There is another point. I contend that this Bill, even if it contained no other provision than the Arbitration Clause, would be of very great advantage to the agricultural industry. For years there has been a very great want for a clause of this kind in the relations between tenant farmers and landlords. Up to the present time if a tenant farmer desired to get justice from his landlord he had to begin by issuing a statement of claim, which in certain circumstances involved summonses for particulars and summonses for further and better particulars; these summonses in Chambers would, perhaps, involve two or three attendances before the Judge, and possibly an appeal. That would be followed by a statement of defence, and a reply. In a particular case I have in mind this was followed by a notice of trial; the trial actually took place before a special jury at the assizes, and certain gentlemen were specially taken down to attend. The trial had not gone on very long before it was referred, and the reference took place. Each side appointed an arbitrator, the two arbitrators appointed an umpire, and a considerable number of days were occupied in taking evidence on each side. Those who know anything about these proceedings know that the expenses incurred before getting to arbitration were very serious indeed. Now, I am glad to say, although it is much against the interest of the profession of which I am a humble member, the tenant farmers can obtain justice and get their claims satisfied without any of that very heavy preliminary expense. There is one other point in regard to the clause to which I should like to call attention. Fault was found with it because of the costs involved. But by the terms of Clause 14, which deals with costs, those costs are in the discretion of the arbitrator, and if the arbitrator finds that the tenant farmer has a fair claim to compensation which has not been fairly met by the landlord it will be undoubtedly his duty to award costs against the landlord, and in that case the tenant would be relieved of the costs, or the greater part of them. I am sure a great number of tenant farmers would welcome this Bill with satisfaction and gratitude.

*MR. BRYNMOR JONES (Swansea District): I think the hon. and learned Member for the Wisbech Division speaks with considerable authority when he says this Bill will be welcomed by many tenant farmers, but it will be welcomed only in English counties, not in Wales. It is a Bill which wholly fails to satisfy the pledges given by hon. Members opposite, and candidates who stood in the Unionist interest at the election of 1895 in the thirteen counties of Wales and Monmouthshire. I do not wish to delay the passing of this Bill into law. For what it is we are willing to accept it, and, for myself, I am not going to vote against it. But I think that we who represent Welsh constituencies have been a great deal too forbearing in regard to the conduct of Welsh agricultural matters by the present Government. I am sorry the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Agriculture is not in his place to-night. I regret the cause of his absence, and I join in the tribute paid by the hon. Member for East Glamorganshire to the courtesy with which he has invariably treated us in regard to matters concerning the Department over which he presides. But the position in Wales with regard to this Agricultural Holdings Bill is entirely special. The right hon. Gentleman himself, in the debate on the Second Reading of this Bill, practically admitted that the case for Wales was distinct from the case for England or Scotland. Let me briefly recall the recent history of this land question in Wales, and the demands made by Welsh tenant farmers —demands which I understand the right hon. Gentleman and the Government say are sufficiently met by the Bill now before the House. As far back as 1843 and 1844 there were strong demands made for a reform of agricultural tenancies in Wales and Monmouthshire, especially in those parts of Wales in which the prevailing language was the Welsh language. From 1839 to 1843 there were serious dis

turbances in Wales, which came to be known as the "Rebecca Riots," and which were due to agrarian causes. From the time when these riots broke out down to the present there has been a persistent movement in favour of altering the law relating to landlord and tenant. It is not so much the question whether the mere formal legal tenure is satisfactory that agitates the minds of the tenant farmers; it is the economic question of how the system is carried out. Down to about the end of the last century there was very little trouble in Wales. But about the beginning of the century, and especially after the close of the Great War, a new system was introduced, under which the landlord undertook practically to make all the improvements on agricultural holdings. That was the theory and the understanding, but the system has broken down in certain parts of the country, though not everywhere; for the tenant in many cases has to supply labour, and also do the haulage of materials—a very costly item in a mountainous country. On the whole the result was to produce a state of profound dissatisfaction among Welsh tenant farmers, and the state of dissatisfaction has continued down to the present time. When the agricultural industry, as a whole, is making better profits you naturally do not hear so many complaints, and there was a time when the Welsh complaints sank down because agricultural prices were so high; but the Welsh tenant farmers have never lost sight of the grievances which, having regard to the special circumstances of the Principality, are necessarily inflicted upon them. Many complaints were made in the Welsh newspapers, and, as a result, in 1892 the Welsh landlords asked the then Conservative Government to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into the alleged grievances of the tenant farmers of Wales. The Government refused. In the middle of 1892 there was a change of Government; the demands for a Royal Commission were renewed from many quarters, and ultimately, in March, 1893, Mr. Gladstone appointed a Royal Commission with a designedly broad reference to consider all the questions connected with the holding, occupation, and cultivation of land in Wales. That Commission, like most Commissions, was not absolutely equal in its party complexion, but at any rate there were upon it three gentlemen representing the party opposite—namely, Lord Kenyon, my hon. colleague in the representation of Swansea, and Mr. Frederic Seebohm. There were also Principal Rhys, a man who had taken no overt part in politics at all, two tenant farmers, the chairman of the Monmouthshire County Council, and myself. We did our best to inquire into the matters referred to us, and it has been entirely overlooked by our critics that the statement of facts in the Report as to the condition of things in the Principality has never been challenged by anybody. Nearly the whole of the Report is signed by all the Commissioners, and is simply a statement of facts connected with the Principality. Some may say that a number of our facts were irrelevant. ["Hear, hear!"] An hon. Member says "Hear, hear!" What facts are irrelevant to a broad consideration of the argument? Does he contend that the history of the country has no relevancy to the question with which this Bill is concerned? If so, that is a very narrow point of view to take. If you say, "It is my first principle that we are going to have absolutely the same law for the whole of the United Kingdom," the particular facts connected with the history of any particular county or collection of counties are, of course, irrelevant. But is the adoption of such a principle as that statesmanship? Not at all. That is what hon. Gentlemen like my hon. friend opposite have failed to grasp in regard to our notion of what a Report on Land in Wales and Monmouthshire ought to be, and what the legislation in regard to land in Wales ought to be. But I will not pursue that topic, as I want to come to something which is absolutely and entirely relevant to this Bill. Having given our best consideration to the matter, we arrived at a series of conclusions, absolutely clear, very important, and which ought to carry weight with the Government and with the country. One of the first things we agreed upon was this—

> "We have no right to pronounce on the question whether such an amendment of the Agricultural Holdings Act, 1883——"

That refers to certain much more drastic amendments of the Act of 1883 than are contained in the present Bill.

> "—— and of the law of landlord and tenant as to agricultural holdings is required for England as well as for Wales; but without prejudice to this question we think that the circumstances disclosed in regard to Wales by

our inquiry urgently call for legislation such as we have above sketched, and that it would be expedient to deal with the case of Wales in a separate Bill for this purpose, however desirable it may be as a general rule to avoid separate or particular legislation."

I call the attention of the Attorney General to that sentence in the Report. It was signed by supporters of the present Government. But I do not want to make too much of that point, because there is something more important than that. Lord Kenyon is one of the most popular and best landlords in Wales; so also is my hon. friend the Member for Swansea Town. They are both large landowners; men are eager to become tenants on their estates. This paragraph was signed by them, although their whole spirit, in a sense, was against the idea of any recognition of Wales as a separate nation. Nor, indeed, do I claim that sentence as necessarily involving any theory of a separate nationality. The point I put as a practical point for the consideration of the Government is that there are many matters within the sphere of jurisprudence which may well be treated separately. I know that in regard to the marriage laws, bills of exchange, mercantile documents, and so on, it would be very inconvenient and inexpedient to have separate legislation for different parts of the United Kingdom. But when you come to matters relating to land the question is quite different. It is right and proper, if you want to have a good economic system for the whole of the Kingdom, that the particular circumstances of counties, districts, or provinces should be taken into account by the legislature in dealing with these matters. Our first complaint against the Government, therefore, is that we are not given a separate Bill. We demand that Bill; we say that you have directly or indirectly promised us that Bill; friends of yours sat upon the Commission; they have assented to it; they applied their minds to the question; they did their work honestly; that is the conclusion at which they arrived. I am not going into minute details, as we are all practically agreed that this Bill should become law. But let me point out what were the conclusions at which that Commission unanimously arrived. They agreed that, having regard to what took place in 1868 and years afterwards—although they would not admit that the tenure from year to year was necessarily a bad kind of tenure for agricultural purposes—the unlimited right of the landlord, without any cause shown, to give notice to quit to the tenant ought not to be further maintained. Accordingly, one of their unanimous recommendations is that in case a landlord gives notice to quit to a tenant without reasonable cause, and if the tenant has paid his rent and has not been guilty of any breach of the covenants or the conditions in the agreement, there should be, in the discretion of the arbitrator, an amount allowed as compensation for capricious disturbance. That is not in this Bill. If you want to make the relations between landlord and tenant fair, the special circumstances of Wales demand the insertion of such a clause. We have made no general charge against the landlords of Wales, but at the same time, especially in regard to the smaller estates, there are evictions from time to time for which no reason satisfactory to the district in which the event takes place can be given. The result is very disadvantageous from many points of view. It disturbs other farmers on the estate; it disturbs the whole parish; it gives rise to all sorts of suspicious feelings on the part of the tenant farmers. In any case, evictions without cause are not fair in a country with the historic circumstances of Wales, where in many cases the families of the present tenant farmers have been on the same holdings for hundreds of years. I need hardly point out that it was proved, not only before our own Commission, but also before the Agricultural Commission for England, that to make a man move from one farm to another was practically tantamount to fining him 20 per cent. on the whole capital invested in the farm. I beg in all seriousness, and without any polemical intent, the Government to take notice of a significant fact like that, and that men like Lord Kenyon, and practically all the best agents in Wales, are quite willing to assent to a clause providing for compensation for capricious disturbance. The majority of the Commission adopted the theory of a land court, not at all in the sense of the Irish Act of 1881, nor did our proposed legislation create a dual ownership. On that I say nothing. We cannot expect this Government to do anything of that kind, and therefore I will not say anything in support of the general plan of the majority of the Commission. But there was

another practical point suggested by all the Commissioners. It was to prevent the injustice which in practice arises from the fact that the rent is often raised upon the improvements of the sitting tenant. The matter is not quite easy to explain, and perhaps the law itself is not entirely to blame, but that the injustice does take place is admitted by the three Commissioners I have named. It happens in this way. I will take one kind of case only. Supposing there is a large estate going to be sold. The first thing that occurs is, seeing that the purchaser will have the right to demand possession, notice to quit is given to all the tenants. When the 29th September, the usual date for the expiry of the notice, approaches, no Welsh tenant dares give what he has a right to give to his landlord or the persons acting for the landlord, namely, the two months' notice under the Act of 1883 for compensation. If he did that it would be accepted, and he would have to leave on the 29th September, for the simple reason that, owing to the special circumstances of Wales, there are so many demands for these holdings; there is such a great land hunger that the man knows very well that his landlord will let him go, and that he may get something for his improvements under the Act of 1883, but to leave his farm is the very last thing he desires. It is not merely a matter of money with him, for he wants to bring up his family on the holding which from generation to generation his ancestors have occupied. After the sale has taken place and the new purchaser comes upon the scene a revaluation takes place, and the new holder naturally proceeds upon the basis of what the landlord thinks the farm is worth, with the result that rents are raised all round. I do not want to develop these points in detail, but I think I have made the meaning of this unanimous report clear. I wish to call the attention of the Attorney General to the fact that two of the greatest Welsh landlords agreed to this policy. Further we are face to face with cases where estates are heavily mortgaged and in Chancery, and in which trustees for the real owners were in possession. Here exists a state of things under which, if you do this or that, you may be running a risk of pecuniary loss. This Commission unanimously recommended that there should be not a court, but a kind of public arbitration, and that there should be an arbitrator appointed by the Board of Agriculture to deal with estates in that situation. If the tenant complained and the trustee gave the answer, "I dare not comply with your request because I cannot tell what the Chancery judges may do," in that kind of case a suggestion made by the Commissioners was that the Board of Agriculture should appoint mediators or arbitrators to hear both the trustees and the mortgagees when the tenants complain. They shall then say what in their judgment is fair to be done, and the decision of the arbitrators shall be binding upon the Court of Chancery. I have only taken about three points of a definite and practical character in order to show how unfair it is to Wales for the Government to bring in a Bill of this kind as a satisfaction of the claims of the Welsh tenants. This Commission arrived at a definite conclusion about the facts, but its Report has been given the go-by, and no doubt the Government at the next election will claim that they have passed an Agricultural Holdings Act of a highly beneficial character. But that will not go down in Wales. On the Second Reading I put these points before the House and the Government did not attend to them. We are not wild revolutionists, and we are not asking for the breaking up of great estates. The Commission recommended that the best system was one of large estates; but what we object to is allowing a system to go on which is inevitably thrusting out Welshman after Welshman. These farmhouses are the nursery of a very sturdy and vigorous race, and we want to keep these people upon the land where they have lived from generation to generation. We have no desire to introduce any ill-feeling between landlord and tenant, but the course you are taking in neglecting the Report of this Commission is one which will be fraught with disaster to the whole country. We know that the best security a nation can have is a good supply of capable citizens, and you cannot achieve that better than by keeping these old Welsh families on their land. You will not accomplish that by little Bills like this, and you can only do it by taking a broad and statesmanlike view of the whole situation.

MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH (Anglesey): In the county of Anglesey between 1889 and 1893 no less than 11,000 acres of land changed hands, or about one-fourteenth of the acreage of the whole county was sold during four years. I need hardly point out the great significance of a fact like that. The last speaker has reminded us that when a tenant changes from one farm to another it is equivalent to a loss of 20 per cent. of his capital. If that is so, then it is a very easy sum to calculate to find out what a considerable sum of money has been lost by the tenants of Anglesey during the four years I have alluded to. We are almost in agreement in regard to this measure on both sides of the House. I do not agree with the hon. Member for one of the Divisions of Cambridgeshire who said that this Bill did nothing for the landlords. You must benefit the landlords when you give security of tenure, and thus induce the tenant to sink his capital in the soil. To encourage him to do this is to set a premium upon industry and capacity, and this benefits not only the country, but the landlords as well. The object of the Bill is to assist not merely existing tenants, but tenants generally, and I am not in favour of dual ownership or free sale. I am in favour of any reform of the law which will give the tenant better security. Any Bill which gives the tenant greater security is a step in the right direction. The Minority Report states that when a notice to quit was given for any insufficient reason, in that case there should be compensation to the tenant equivalent to a year's rent of his farm. I think that is also a step in the right direction, although it is too late to hope that anything of the kind will be done in this Bill. Nevertheless, I would press upon the Attorney General that he should give us some hope that the Government will see the necessity of taking some such step as this, and that when they have another chance of legislating in that direction they will bear this matter in mind. No amount of compensation for improvement is of itself enough to give security of tenure. The necessity for this exists in the country generally, but more especially in Wales, where the land is not only a financial but a social question. In Wales there is a difference of language, of race, and of creed, and we do ask this House to give to the tenant in Wales some security of tenure under which anyone who turns him out of his farm will have to pay dearly for it.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.): I think the whole of this question rests upon the issue as to whether the conditions in Wales are essentially different from those which exist in England in regard to the claim for land legislation. What I venture to affirm is, that if anyone will take the trouble to inquire into the facts as they really exist in Wales he is bound to come to the conclusion that there is a real difference between the position of the two countries in this respect. In proof of this statement, I need only say that the Welsh Land Commission, after an exhaustive inquiry, came unanimously to that conclusion. The House already knows this from the conclusive arguments used by my hon. friend below me, but I would lay special stress upon their unanimity in regard to some of the most important points we have to consider. I am not going to recapitulate what has already been said in reference to the character of the Welsh Land Commission; neither am I going to describe in detail the important recommendations which they made. I should like to point out, however, that the case of Wales is substantially different in regard to its agriculture to that of England, and our claim to separate legislation in regard to land reform rests broadly upon a different historical development. Anybody who has any knowledge of Welsh life must at once see the differences in race, in language, habits, and customs which so largely prevail between the two countries, and these must have their effect upon the agricultural environments of the two countries. Anybody who has paid the slightest notice to the course of recent events in Wales must have been struck by the very rapid advance made in public opinion in recent years upon this question. So far as the knowledge of the facts of this House and the country generally goes, the development has been more or less recent, because it is a fact that during recent years Wales has had a chance of expressing politically its mind upon these public questions. I would simply remind the House of one or two simple facts showing the depth and reality of the position of Wales in regard to the

question of land reform. The House will remember what took place in 1886, and upon the introduction of the Welsh Land Bill of 1891. I need not remind the House of the appointment of the Commission of 1893 which reported in 1896. But there are one or two practical facts that I should like to mention very briefly to the House, which prove the case which I am endeavouring to make. What are one or two of the practical differences in regard to Welsh and English agricultural life? First of all, there is this fact, that in Wales to-day there are fewer occupying freeholders than in England. In England they number 15 per cent. of the whole, but in Wales the occupying freeholders only number 12 per cent of the whole. In the county of Denbigh the proportion is only 10 per cent. Therefore there exists friction between landlord and tenant in a very acute form. It is almost inevitable that there should be a more acute land-hunger prevailing in Wales than in England, when there is a clear line of cleavage between the general body of landowners and the tenants on great questions of political opinions and of religious creeds. In Wales the farms are smaller than in England; there are more applicants for them, and the country is poorer. If any hon. Member chooses to look closely into this matter he will find abundant proof of what I am saying. In Wales you will find patches on the mountain side which have been cultivated, and I venture to say it would be impossible to find such patches in England. That seems to me to prove fully that there are certain fundamental differences between the two cases. I will mention one further fact, for all these facts to my mind seem very relevant to the discussion, as showing that the Bill we are now discussing—although undoubtedly in certain respects it is an improvement upon the existing law—will not touch even the fringe of the question so far as Wales is concerned. Every question in regard to agricultural reform turns upon one or two considerations. First, there is the question of fixity of tenure. During the first eighty years of this century the rents of the whole of England rose 16·3 per cent., whereas with regard to the rents in Wales during the same period they rose 69·9 per cent. This fact in regard to the greatly enhanced rise of rent in Wales, as compared with England during the present century, is a fact of fundamental importance in the case we are now discussing. That is the reason why I feel that, although we welcome some of the provisions of this Bill, we should make it perfectly clear what the state of agriculture in Wales really is, and prove that Wales in this respect is in a worse condition than England. Wales has had a certain amount of relief, although only temporary, by the rise in prices, but beyond this fact the question is one of very serious moment when we realise the steady depopulation which is going on in the rural districts of Wales. Here are one or two facts which will explain the position clearly to the House: At the beginning of this century the population of Wales was about 500,000, but since that time it has increased 100 per cent. Side by side with this upward movement of the population in Wales there is this serious fact, that from the year 1840 and onwards there has been an alarming decrease in the agricultural population. I will give two instances bearing upon this fact. In a rural sanitary district of which I have personal knowledge, and where I live, there were in the year 1891 over 2,200 less people living there than ten years before, and during the last fifty years there has been an actual increase in the rural population of the country. This falls short of the natural increase by 132,000 people. This question of the draining of the population in rural districts is a very serious one. First of all it has a very direct bearing upon the labour problem, and no one who has any knowledge whatever of the agricultural conditions of Wales and Welsh life can deny that this is a very serious question at the present moment, and unless something is done of a far more drastic nature than will be accomplished by this Bill, I fear that the agricultural outlook in Wales from this standpoint is not a very bright one. But not only is this constant draining of the best life of the country through the depopulation of the rural districts a serious matter from an agricultural point of view, but it is also serious from a national standpoint. I would like to corroborate what has already been said in regard to the best life of Wales lying in the rural districts, and it depends very largely upon agricultural

conditions whether these people remain there or not. If you want them to remain on the soil you must make the conditions of their life more satisfactory. I feel that this Bill, though it is a step in advance, and a step in the right direction, is a very small measure. I will be perfectly frank with the Government. I must differ from my hon. friend below me in saying that I never expected them to carry out the wishes of the great majority of the tenant farmers of Wales in regard to the unanimous recommendations of that Commission. I remember very well a few months ago the Home Secretary saying that if we required legislation of that kind we must go elsewhere to get it. I recognise that fact, but nevertheless I feel it my duty, as representing a large agricultural constituency, to say that, although I welcome this small Bill, I do not accept it as a solution of the Welsh land question.

*MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.): I cannot entirely agree with what fell from my hon. friend who last spoke as to this Bill being altogether a very small step in the right direction. In the few remarks I shall make I shall point out that this Bill is distinctly a retrograde measure from the position taken up in the Act of 1883. At any rate, the intention of the Legislature in 1883, however defective in working out, seems to me to represent a more progressive stage of legislation, judged from the point of view of the tenant farmer and of agriculture, than the present Bill does. I have been entitled to form an opinion on the Welsh question, because the Agriculture Commission on which I sat examined a large number of Welsh witnesses as well as witnesses from England and Scotland. The Welsh witnesses were gentlemen of great ability, and some of them strong representatives of the landlord interest in Wales. I remember one witness in particular, Mr. Tennant, gave extremely important evidence from the landlords' point of view which went to establish unanswerably the general case referred to by my hon. and learned friend. I cannot quite assent to the attitude which my hon. friends have taken up in separating the Welsh land question absolutely from the question of agricultural holdings in England and Scotland. Granting the full strength of the historical arguments as affecting the tenure of land, I cannot admit for a moment that the economic arguments or the legal and equitable arguments are at all different in the case of Welsh farmers from similar arguments in the case of tenant farmers in England and Scotland. After very careful consideration of the evidence it seems to me that the arguments are very much the same as those which induced Sir James Caird and other thoughtful economists and agricultural reformers to advocate much the same group of reforms for England and Scotland which the Welsh Land Commission recommended for Wales. I wish to make my own position clear with regard to the Report of the Welsh Land Commission, because I do not admit that any special reasons—economic or legal—exist for the carrying out of these reforms in Wales which do not exist to an almost equal or even a greater extent in some of the counties of England and Scotland. Before the House assents to the Third Reading of this Bill, as I have no doubt it will, I wish in the first place to express my personal regret that the President of the Board of Agriculture is unable to be present to-night to bring this Bill to a conclusion, much as I differ from many of the arguments which he has advanced during the passage of the measure through the House. It seems to me that this Bill represents a large extension of the power of the landlords in this country. I do not know if the House generally realises how much greater the power of the landlords will be in dealing with their tenants as a result of this Bill. In the first place, while the Bill does not carry out a change suggested by many agricultural reformers, that both parties should have equal rights to put the Act into operation, it gives to the landlord the right to bring the whole of the claims he can make at common law into arbitration as a set-off against the claim of the tenant, and the landlord's claim can now be enforced even if it exceeds the amount which the tenant can prove to be due to him for improvements. That is a distinct and very important alteration of the law. Under the Agricultural Holdings Act of 1883 the landlord could not enforce any counterclaim for a larger amount than the amount awarded as compensation to the tenant. If a tenant established a claim for improvements of £200 under the schedule of the Act of 1883, and his landlord were able to set up

a counter-claim for dilapidations for £300 or £400, he would not be able to recover more than £200; but by the present Bill the landlord can enforce his full claim even if it exceeds the claim established by the tenant. Then, again, he has a longer period for introducing his claim. Seven days after the commencement of the arbitration he may spring any number of claims on the tenant—claims which in my opinion ought not to be sprung on the tenant at all. In some parts of Scotland and also in Lincolnshire arbitrators have held that a receipt for rent should be held to bar claims for previous dilapidations, and that estates ought to be managed so carefully that it should be the duty of the landlord to inform the tenant at the earliest possible moment if he were not properly treating the land, and that arrears for dilapidation and waste should not be allowed to accumulate, and that therefore the landlord should be prevented from springing such unlimited claims on the tenant. Then, again, I maintain that it is a very wrong thing for the Government to provide no limitation whatever after two of its members—the President of the Local Government Board and the President of the Board of Agriculture—had signed a recommendation that in regard to yearly tenancies the limit for counter-claims should be two years. The present limit is four years, and the universal demand has been that it should be limited to two years, but under this Bill the landlord would be perfectly free to set up counter-claims without any limitation whatever, unless, of course, the tenant set up the statute of limitations to bar that. That would mean at best a six years limit, and the result will be that many tenants will be frightened out of making any claim whatever for improvements by the fact that the landlord might bring in unlimited counter-claims, and so place them in the invidious position of having to set up the statute of limitations. That is placing the tenant in a very unfair position. The third point in which it seems to me that the position of the landlord is strengthened is the alteration with regard to freedom of sale of produce. The President of the Board of Agriculture has stated that he will introduce in another place some further alterations into the fourth subsection of Clause 1, but the Bill as it stands will undoubtedly place the landlord in a position in which he can bar the right of freedom of sale by special agreement as to the amount of manurial return, and in the case of holdings near large towns when it has been understood that there was perfect freedom, the tenant sending on his produce and carting back manure, a perfectly fair arrangement might thus be set aside. The next point in which the landlord is placed in a stronger position than he is now, is that the parties will not be on an equality as regards the serving of notices. The main extension of the landlord's power is one, however, which I think neither the House nor the country have fully grasped the meaning of. It is rather a difficult question to explain, as I found myself when I endeavoured to explain it to some practical farmers at the Council Meeting of the Chambers in Westminster Hall. The first sub-section of Clause 2 undoubtedly gives to the landlord a power which he does not at present possess of depriving his tenant of any right to have recourse to the arbitration procedure provided under the Act. The landlord will now be enabled to insist on an agreement in regard to arbitration, not only as to the conditions under which settlements are to be arrived at, but that on his estate all disputes are to be referred to Mr. So and So. It is desirable that the landlord and tenant should be free to agree as to the scales of compensation for various improvements at the beginning of the tenancy. It is also perfectly reasonable that when claims are made for compensation for improvements at the end of the tenancy, the time and mode of payment should be settled by agreement, but there is a tremendous difference between the old Act and the Bill, because under the Bill the arbitrator is bound to have regard to any agreement that may be in force at the time. An agreement may have been entered into years and years before without any consideration of the special circumstances under which the tenancy may be terminated, and it is not in the interest of fair and reasonable procedure we are providing in the Bill that we should give to the landlord the power of being able to say to the tenant, "There is a clause in your agreement which prevents your doing anything under the Act. You may think you are able to proceed to arbitration provided by the the Act of Parliament, but your agreement bars that, and you are absolutely at

my mercy." That is a very important alteration, and I may say I was profoundly disappointed when the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Agriculture finally refused to remove that enormous power from the hands of the landlords. It seems to me that this is a "take it or leave it" Bill, and that landlords and agents will be enabled to force estate agreements on the tenants wherever they are in a strong enough position. For these and other reasons I feel very strongly as to the character of this Bill, which, if this tremendous power were removed from the landlords, might, with Amendments, be made a very useful and desirable measure. I now turn to the other side of the picture. What does the tenant get out of this Bill? He gets the right to make a garden under one acre, the right to plant an orchard, also under one acre, and the right to make osier beds under one acre. He will also get a few shillings for the droppings of his horses, which will be a most trivial compensation. Then there is also a trivial concession for temporary pasture. And even that is made wholly prospective. I put down, in pursuance of the suggestion of Mr. Clare Sewell Read, a proviso that in the case of temporary pasture, compensation would be given for the improvement if made not more than three years before the end of the tenancy; but even this concession was rejected when moved by my hon. friend the Member for North Hampshire. I should have thought that some appreciation of what the tenants of England, especially in the Eastern Counties, have done during the last years to keep themselves and the landlords going would have been shown. But no; the concessions which have been given to the tenants are really too trivial to mention. There will be no real extension of their powers under this Bill, whereas enormous powers are given to the landlords. I must say that I do wish that we had in this House a few representatives of the farming interest. That would be a very good thing for us, and I would not care whether they sat on the Conservative benches or on these benches; I would welcome them all the same. The Government have rejected many suggestions made by the Chambers of Agriculture, and many suggestions made by the Commissions; they have rejected the principle of giving the tenant freedom in carrying out improvements suitable for his holding, and the principle that a tenant farmer should be placed in the same position as every other temporary holder of real estate who is dispossessed of it and loses trade interests and goodwill thereby. The Government have also rejected the Amendment, which was supported by the Chamber of Agriculture, as regards the laying down of permanent pasture. It seems to me that the tenant farmers of England, who are mainly supporters of the party opposite, have been treated in this Bill with singular ingratitude. The Government have thrown away an enormous opportunity of dealing with a great economic question which is of vast importance to the country. It was the best type of tenant farmers who during the period of depression kept the landlords going, proving that agriculture in qualified hands is a sound and progressive industry. But it is a terrible thing that, as a conclusion of all these Commissions and inquiries, and as a wind up of all the information which has been received as to the causes of agricultural depression, this trumpery measure should be the result, and that it should give increased powers to the landlords, who have done so much to hinder agriculture in the past, and should have no regard for the equitable rights of the tenants or the economic rights of the State.

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY (Shropshire, Newport): I should like to deal with the debate as far as it has progressed. It is significant to us on this side of the House that the debate should have been opened by a Scotch Member who dwells in London, and who has never owned or occupied any agricultural land whatever. Then we have had the intervention of the distinguished representative from England who has just sat down, and, in accordance with his reputation, he has spoken at great length. I cannot help telling the hon. Member, in all courtesy and all straightforwardness, that in the general opinion of all agriculturists in this country, whether occupiers or owners, inasmuch as he has not had the advantage of any practical acquaintance with the subject, he is regarded merely as an agricultural phonograph, and that agriculturists are not prepared to accept his opinions on these questions. If there is one branch of industry

more than another with which it is necessary that a man should have a practical acquaintance before he lays down the law, it is agriculture. We have heard nothing but groans from our acquaintance, who has nothing whatever to do with the practical management of land either as farmer or owner. He has been talking in many instances to those who have spent their whole lives as owners or farmers, and who knew the practical economic conditions of land management. The propositions which he has laid down are for the most part rotten and altogether untenable, and would never have been laid down by anyone who had not the audacity of ignorance in these matters. We have heard of the intervention of Scottish pedants, and of the agricultural phonographs, but the intervention of the Welsh Members is of another character. I welcome with all cordiality their perfectly different tone. The name oftenest used by the Welsh Members in support of their views is that of a noble relative of mine; but perhaps I have talked over this subject more frequently with him than they have, and know more of his opinions than they do. I have the honour and pleasure of being the representative of an English constituency separated from Wales only by an imaginary line. Therefore, it can well be imagined that the Welsh case has particular interest for me; and sometimes I could not help wondering whether the hon. Members from Wales have not mistaken their own case. At any rate, these hon. Members will not accuse me of any want of courtesy if I do not agree with them. Some of their arguments are difficult to understand. One hon. Member said that the loss when a change of tenancy occurred was very considerable to the tenant; but it should be remembered that the loss to the owner is just as great as to the tenant. Then something was said about the acute differences which exist in Wales, because the landlord holds a creed different from that of his tenant, the landlord being a member of the Established Church, and the tenant a Nonconformist. But we have instances in England, Scotland, Ireland, and parts of Wales where large landowners belong to the Roman Catholic Church, and yet they are on absolutely good terms with the Protestant tenants on their estates. I do not think it is a sound argument to say that in Wales there is an acute divergence between landlord and tenant because they are of different creeds. We were told that one of the reasons why Wales had a right to difference of treatment to the rest of the United Kingdom was that, most unfortunately, the agricultural population there was decreasing, and that the competition for farms was enormous. It seems to me that these arguments are contradictory and self-destructive. Then a statement was made that in Wales there had been a very considerable rise in the value of the rental of land. Let the hon. Gentleman who used that argument go into an estate office and see the enormous increase in the amount spent on farms and on farm buildings by the landlords. For many years I have been an active trustee on the largest estate in Wales, and I can say without fear of contradiction that the expenditure of late years on estates in Wales has been so great as to justify, at any rate, some improvement in the rent. It is curious to me that the argument has been raised that there has been a greater demand for land than in England. Is there not something in this: that in Wales there are smaller holdings and smaller farms than exist in some portions of England? It is well known that even in England the demand for small farms is considerable and satisfactory, and the demand for large farms is often deficient. I come to another question of which I may be expected to know something. I have a warm feeling for Wales by every tie of neighbourhood and family descent. I live in the county I represent, which is only separated from Wales by an artificial line. There are several estates partly in Shropshire and partly over the Welsh border. Now I have been told that on these estates, on one side of the river or high road, there is absolute contentment on the part of the tenants with their tenure, and absolutely none of the feelings described by hon. Gentlemen opposite. But on merely crossing the river or road you find tenants, who hold from the same landlord and on the same tenure, with a hopeless and burning desire for a change of their condition. It merely means that where the English system has penetrated with the greatest vigour, there the Welsh national desires seem to have lessened and the national feeling seems to have become less acute. The argument, therefore, is to further introduce the English system instead of

the Welsh, which the hon. Gentleman wishes to champion and uphold. Although I frankly admit the right hon. Gentleman has a right to use the results of the Welsh Land Commission in his favour, I hold to my opinion that the attempt to raise what I believe to be an absolutely artificial distinction between the condition of Wales and that of England must be extremely bad in the first instance to the Welsh farmers. I cannot help feeling that as we thresh out this question we shall approach a state of things in which Wales will not be unwilling to learn what England has to teach, and England will not be unwilling to learn what Wales has to teach. I believe that there is rather a lurking desire in the background on the part of some hon. Gentlemen to create something dangerously akin to that dual ownership which has been the curse of the sister isle. I am therefore one of those who welcome this Bill, all the more because it is not what it is the fashion to call a drastic Bill. I am afraid drastic legislation is generally dangerous legislation, and introduced by the most ignorant sections of the legislature. Therefore, inasmuch as this Bill proceeds on moderate lines, it is, I believe, all the more likely to be useful. Though it does not embody all the suggestions we could have wished, it does embrace many which are extremely valuable and likely to do good. It does not go as far as many of those interested in agriculture would have liked to go; but it may be amended in that direction at a future time. It, however, meets points wanting remedy, and will place the conditions of landlord and tenant on a better footing. It may be that some future Parliament will take up all the Acts on agricultural tenancy, and codify them in a form which will be much more intelligible than now to people who are unacquainted with the law. I think the reception given to the Bill has been in fair accordance with its merits. Those who have no political end in view, but only a desire to see a moderate change in the agricultural and social conditions of the United Kingdom, welcome the Bill, and the Government may rest assured that it will be so received in all parts of the country.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs): I cannot congratulate the hon. and gallant Member for Newport on the very excitable performance which he has just made, which can only be explained on the suspicion that the hot weather has affected him. His attack on the hon. Member for East Northamptonshire was exceedingly uncalled for and unjustifiable. I attended some of the meetings of the Grand Committee on Trade when this Bill was under discussion, and I found my hon. friend addressing himself to the details of the Bill in a most intelligent manner, which showed that his study of the questions at issue had been very thorough. It is remarkable that, although the hon. Member for Newport made this attack in sweeping terms on the hon Member for East Northamptonshire, he has not condescended to address himself to a single point of criticism of the Bill before the House. The hon. Gentleman has taken upon himself to speak on behalf of the tenant farmers of Wales as well as of England. He complained of my hon. friend as being a mere agricultural phonograph, but I cannot say that my hon. friend is a phonograph of Welsh opinion. The Welsh farmers have spokesmen on their own behalf, although it seems to have been reserved for the hon. Gentleman who represents the English constituency of Newport to voice the real grievances of the Welsh tenant farmers. The hon. Member said that he had a practical acquaintance with agriculture, but he will allow me to say that his views on this subject are rather vitiated, to the extent that he represents only one party and not the other. His views on this question might be as unconscionable as mine would be on a bill of costs. After all, he represents the landlord interest, and he understands it from that point of view. Undoubtedly he knows something about Welsh estates; but, unfortunately, he represents the best Welsh estates. He does not know anything of the Welsh estates of which we complain, and to which both the majority and the minority of the Welsh Commission referred. If all the estates were managed like those with which the hon. Member is identified, I venture to say that the Welsh land question would never have reached the acute phase which the House is forced to recognise as now existing, by the fact that we are taking three or four hours in discussing these points. Therefore, the hon. Gentleman is not a very good witness in

a matter of that sort. I disagree with the hon. Member for East Northamptonshire as much as the hon. Member for Newport on certain points. Neither of the two hon. Members really understands the Welsh land question. My hon friend, it is true, sat on the Agricultural Commission, and upon the basis of certain evidence given before that Commission he comes to the conclusion that the Welsh question is practically identical with the English question. I will tell the hon. Member why he should not come to that conclusion. The Welsh tenant farmers in fact practically ignored that Commission. The only evidence given was by Welsh landowners and agents, and only one or two tenants. But before the Welsh Land Commission evidence was given by Welsh tenant farmers from all over Wales, and they did not think it worth their while to come up to London to give evidence before the English Commission, especially when, with one or two exceptions, they had no confidence in its members. The real difficulty in the case of Wales is not altogether economic. It is to a large extent a question of sentiment. It is all very well for the hon. Gentleman to say that when he comes to Shropshire he finds no difficulty. But it is very curious that wherever you get a Celtic peasantry, whether it be in the Highlands of Scotland, or in Ireland, or in Wales, there is the same difficulty—namely, the sentimental clinging to the soil, which renders it hard for them to judge the question of rent from a purely commercial point of view, impartially and calmly; it seems to hamper their judgment altogether. The hon. Gentleman knows very well that when you get hold of one of these peasants on a small farm in the hills, he will pay any rent up to the last penny in his possession before he will quit his farm. It is not the owners of estates represented by the hon. Member for Newport that will take advantage of that sentiment. They know that these men are very good tenants. But the difficulty comes in when you come to the small landowners, especially when you come to the men who invest in land and want it to pay 4 and 5 per cent. These take advantage of the sentimental weakness of the peasant, and utilise that in order to raise the rent and extort from him the uttermost farthing; and when that fails they let the holding to another man who would be also ready to pay his last penny. The English tenant farmer, on the other hand, is much cooler, and takes a more or less commercial view of the transaction. He says, "This land does not pay me," and he gives it up. Unfortunately that is not the case with the small farmers in Wales, Scotland and Ireland, who go on borrowing from each other to keep on their holdings until the whole community is more or less bankrupt. I wish to call attention to the way in which the Government has been dealing with these Commissions on Agriculture and the Land question. We have had an Agricultural Commission for England and Wales, which made two or three recommendations. They brought in an interim Report in 1896, and the moment it was presented there was legislation upon it—so far as it was favourable to the landlords—almost before the ink with which it was written was dry. Then we waited for two or three years, until we got the final Report of the Commission, with recommendations in favour of the tenant farmer; but session after session passed before we got this Bill. And what do we find? That the Bill does not carry out the moderate recommendations of that Commission, and falls short even of the recommendations most favourable to the landlords ever presented to Parliament. That is the way in which the landlords and tenant farmers of England have been treated by the Government. Well, there is the Welsh Land Commission, which presented a Report at the end of 1895. There were a few recommendations made unanimously by that Commission, which included the hon. Baronet the Member for Swansea, Lord Kenyon, and Professor Seebohm—all Liberal Unionists, but gentlemen who understood Welsh agricultural questions, and who were large Welsh landlords. Surely the Government might have taken their recommendations, because they represented the minimum of the Welsh tenant farmers' claims; but they absolutely ignored these recommendations. Then there was the Commission on Local Taxation, which made an interim Report in favour of a dole to another section of the supporters of Her Majesty's Government, and that was embodied in legislation in the same session. That is the way in which these Commissions and their Reports have been dealt with. Whenever there is a recommendation

which is favourable to the landlords and the Government supporters, we get legislation; but when it is for the benefit of the tenant farmer we get a niggardly Bill like this before the House.

MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN (Montgomeryshire): I have only a few words to add in support of the strong case which has been made out by my hon. friend, but I am unwilling to give a silent vote upon this matter, because this is the only opportunity I shall have of giving voice to the opinion of the great majority of my constituents. We have heard that there is very little difference between the Welsh and English cases, but that is disproved by the fact that while the English Members have dealt freely with the Bill itself, the Welsh Members have not thought it worth while to criticise the Bill itself, but have spoken on the Amendment of my hon. friend the Member for East Glamorganshire. It appears to me that the provision for compensation is good so far as it goes, but it does not meet the demands of the Welsh people. It has been said that the ordinary relation of landlord and tenant as created by English law is a relation such as no Christian man would offer and no sane man would accept, and there is a great deal of truth in that remark. Something has been done to mitigate the inequity of the law by previous Agricultural Acts, but there are two hardships which are involved in the relationship of landlord and tenant. The first is due to the doctrine that whatever is placed in the soil adheres to the soil and is the property of the landlord—that enables the landlord to confiscate the improvements of the tenant; and the second is insecurity of tenure, which by law is only from year to year. I am quite aware that the English tenant regards his position as tenant far more from a commercial point of view than the Welshman. A short time ago a friend told me that in his part of the country it was a regular thing for tenants, if they felt the least disinclination to continue on their farms, to give notice at once and remove elsewhere, without the least consideration as to whether it was their ancestral home or not. Now I can speak with considerable confidence of the Welsh temperament, and I can say that the Welsh tenant does not move from a farm upon which his ancestors have lived without great difficulty or great disagreement with his landlord, and when he does move he does not move far. He desires to live in the same parish, or at any rate the same county. He does not so much want to be compensated for improvements which he has made as to be secure in his holding. My hon. and gallant friend the Member for Newport spoke of Shropshire, and I do not deny that he is perfectly acquainted with that county and the parts of Wales bordering on that county, but it is a matter of common knowledge that there is debateable land on the frontier between two different races where the one blends into the other, and that is the case with Wales and Shropshire. English influence has spread along the valley of the Severn, and the farmers on the east side are a very different class to the farmers on the hills on the west side, and what my hon. and gallant friend said of his Flint and Denbigh neighbours may be perfectly true, but when you come to the men who live upon the hills, who speak Welsh as their native language, and only speak English for its commercial convenience, you come to a totally different economic condition of things. Those are the men who, above all, are pressing for security of tenure in their holdings. My hon. and gallant friend made the claim on behalf of Welsh landlords that they had spent a great deal of money upon building, but, if he is cognisant of the management of a large estate, he may have had to deal with borrowing from land improvement companies for improving estates held by tenants for life, and if he has he will know that as a rule the justification given to the Board of Agriculture for imposing these burdens on the fee simple is that they are needed to maintain the existing rents. My strong inclination is to believe that the expenditure which has been made upon different estates, though excellent in itself, is an expenditure which does not justify the raising of rents, but one which simply puts the house in a condition in accordance with modern civilisation, and the modern standard of comfort. With regard to dual ownership, I do not advocate it, and I have heard it disclaimed by the Welsh farmers, who do not want it. They want security of tenure against capricious eviction. The days of capricious eviction are over, but apprehensions of it still pre-

vail, and it is a great social evil that the Welsh farmers think themselves unable to speak out their minds in matters of politics or religious conviction lest it should lead to such capricious eviction. I regret that the Government, from their fanatical desire for uniformity, have refused to give consideration to the special case of the Welsh tenant farmer, and hope that if they have another lease of power they will take care to do so in a future session.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs): I very much regret the absence of my right hon. friend the President of the Board of Agriculture, but I think that, had he been here, he would have had every reason to be satisfied with the debate that has taken place. There has been in all parts of the House a recognition of the fact that the Bill marks a substantial step in advance. All are agreed that the Bill is not quite satisfactory, but in all quarters it has been recognised that it has done a great deal in simplifying the procedure, and that it has done away with one grievance—that it has enlarged the scope in which compensation can be claimed in urban districts. It is true that we have had expressions of satisfaction from all quarters, and the only exception from the general unanimity has been in the speech of the hon. Member for East Aberdeenshire, who denounced the Bill root and branch; but I appeal from the hon. Member to the Scottish Chamber of Agriculture, a highly representative body, and one thoroughly conversant with the subject both in practice and theory. That Chamber formally declared that the Bill would be of substantial benefit to landed proprietors as well as to tenants, and would contribute to a considerable extent to promote the interests of agriculture in the country. The criticisms of English Members have been devoted entirely to details, and in some of these criticisms they are wrong. The hon. Member for East Northamptonshire appears to think the Bill confers on the landlords, with regard to claims, privileges which they did not previously enjoy. The hon. Member is absolutely mistaken. The main effect of the Bill is to do what is in the interests of landlord and tenant alike. The hon. Member has lost himself in details and has failed to appreciate what the scope and effect of the Bill are. Passing to the friendly criticisms of the Welsh Members, they have recognised that, while the Bill does not do all they could wish, it makes a substantial step in advance. This will be a great satisfaction to the President of the Board of Agriculture. It was suggested that Wales should be accorded separate treatment in respect of agricultural land. Wales would lose more than she would gain if separate treatment were established. The hon. Member for Carnarvon said the population of Wales was Celtic, and there was such "earth-hunger" that the tenants would pay any rents rather than quit their homes. I do not believe this is a matter of race; it is much more a matter of economic condition. In many parts of the country owing to accidental circumstances there are no facilities for enterprise of any other kind. There are no industrial openings, and the only career a man feels he has open to him is to farm his land as his fathers did before him. As other industries are opened up the most malignant symptoms of this "earth-hunger" will disappear in Wales as elsewhere. Complaint has been made that the Report of the Welsh Land Commission with regard to the circumstances of Welsh agriculture has been ignored; but it is not fair to say that, because several very important recommendations of the Commission have been given effect to in the Bill. Then, three suggestions have been made. The first was that there ought to be compensation for disturbance, and, in fact, fixity of tenure. I ask hon. Members who make that suggestion to bear in mind that there is an increasing disinclination on the part of farmers to bind themselves down on the land for any long period. Is a tenant farmer to have the right to stop as long as he likes on the land, while he is not to be bound to stop as long as the landlord may desire to have him as a tenant? You cannot have one-sided legislation of that sort. Another proposition made was that some provision ought to have been made for securing compensation for improvements to the sitting tenant as distinguished from the quitting tenant. Is a tenant to be able to require the landlord to buy his improvements, and then to have the benefit of them without paying any rent in respect of them? If we give compensation, the inevitable result must be that what we

put into one pocket we must take out of the other. A third suggestion was that in the case of estates in Wales which got into Chancery the Board of Agriculture should be appointed a sort of assessor to the Court of Chancery and advise the judge as to the management of the estates. There are grave objections to such a system of dual management. The hon. Member for South-east Essex suggested that the law affecting agriculture should be codified. I should be glad to see such codification undertaken if it would be useful; but I do not believe the ordinary tenant farmer would find the benefit arising from it that hon. Members expect. Anyone who wants to know the law about agriculture will get a much better idea out of a text-book than out of an Act of Parliament. If I want to know anything with regard to a subject with which I am not conversant I would much rather take up a text-book, from which I should be sure to get a better view than by puzzling through an Act of Parliament. I say we ought not to attach too much importance to the actual wording of an Act of Parliament. There is never any want of men in the profession to which I have the honour to belong who are ready to explain the most obscure Acts of Parliament, and who are ready to bring out treatises, in which everything is made as clear as possible. On the whole, I ask the House without a dissentient voice to give a Third Reading to this Bill.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs): I wish to join in the expression of regret at the absence of the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Agriculture, and also in the protest against this Bill as an entirely insufficient measure to meet the needs of the Welsh tenant farmer. I am surprised that the Government continue to give so many object lessons as to the utter futility of appointing Royal Commissions. I imagine the time is not far distant when gentlemen who are well qualified to serve on Royal Commissions will absolutely decline to do so, if they retain any self-respect whatever, because recommendations in the case of Commission after Commission have been deliberately set aside by even the Government which appointed the Commission. In the case of the particular Commission here concerned, exception has been taken to it because it was appointed by a Liberal Government. But it had upon it gentlemen who command the confidence of the vast majority of hon. Gentlemen opposite—men like the hon. Baronet the Member for Swansea Town and Lord Kenyon. I might give instances of other Royal Commissions, appointed by Conservative and Unionist Governments, which have made identically the same recommendations, and which recommendations are before the House in the form of Bills, and yet—I do not know whether it is because they relate to Wales—those recommendations have been absolutely rejected by the present Government. I venture to think that this is not a proper course of proceeding, and I trust that in future we shall have a little more attention paid to the findings of these Royal Commissions. The hon. and learned Gentleman who has just spoken has attacked the position which we, as representing Welsh constituencies, have taken up. He has practically denied that there is any difference whatever between Wales and England in regard to the conditions under which land is held. One of the reasons he gave for the land hunger that exists in Wales is that the industrial openings in Wales are few as compared with those in other parts of the kingdom. That, however, is not the case. There are plenty of industrial openings both in North and in South Wales. The families of tenant farmers and labourers who have hitherto been in the employ of tenant farmers have at the present time the most abundant opportunities possible of leaving the country, of serving on railways, of going to factories, mines, or quarries. So far as industrial openings are concerned, they exist in North and South Wales to as great an extent as in most other parts of the Kingdom. The hon. and learned Gentleman controverted the argument that that land hunger arises very largely from the fact that Wales has been peopled by a Celtic race. The hon. and learned Gentleman adduced some instances in which there has been Teutonic blood in the Celtic races, but there was one consideration he entirely forgot in regard to Wales, and that was the language. In Wales nearly a million people

speak the Welsh language, and a very large proportion of that million speak Welsh alone. They hear of openings in the rural districts of England, but they do not avail themselves of them. Why is that the case? It is because the Welsh language is the language of their hearts and their homes, the language they have heard all their life, the language in which they have worshipped from earliest infancy. Hon. Members have very little idea of the enormous wrench it is to a Welshman, who has been accustomed to speak and to be spoken to and to worship in the Welsh language, to leave his home for other parts, even for a part in which he is certain to make his fortune, and to live under infinitely better economic conditions than obtain in Wales. If the hon. and learned Gentleman knew more of Wales in this respect he would understand that the sentimental tie—if so you like to call it—is extremely strong, and that it binds a Welshman to his own home and to the country in which his language is spoken. There are other considerations as well. We have heard that holdings in Wales are comparatively small, but the hon. Member for Newport appeared to think the conditions were practically the same in England as in Wales in this respect. I can only take the country as a whole. The holdings from twenty to fifty acres are over 20 per cent. of the total of holdings in Wales, as compared with 14 per cent. in England; and the holdings of from sixty to a hundred acres are over 16 per cent. of the holdings in Wales and only about 10 per cent. in England. Then again with regard to labour—and I would especially call attention to this point—the average number of labourers employed varies from ten in the eastern counties of England to five in the western counties on each farm; in Wales the number of labourers is from one and a half to two on each farm. As further illustrating the economic difference between England and Wales in this respect, I may say that the Welsh farmers, their families, and the labourers boarded on the farms, do two-thirds of the work of the farm; in Eng- they do only one-third. I will give very shortly some official figures which show that the land hunger in Wales must have affected very materially indeed the rents originally charged in that country. The variations in the agricultural assessments to income tax for the twenty-nine years ending April, 1894, show that rents in the seven eastern counties of Wales have fallen to the level at which they stood in 1864; in the six western counties they are now, in spite of the depreciation, 18½ per cent. higher than they were in 1864, or, taking the whole of Wales together, the net increase amounts to 7·8 per cent. In England, on the other hand, the rents have fallen 15·2 per cent. below the level of 1864. It is therefore perfectly obvious that there is a considerable difference between England and Wales in this respect. There is one thing I very deeply regret in connection with this Bill. The hon. and learned Gentleman has spoken of it as having been agreed by us to be a substantial step in advance. I wish it were. It is a step in advance, otherwise we should be challenging the Third Reading; but to say we agree it is a substantial step in advance is, I think, going a little further than is warranted by the circumstances of the case. I regret that the clause proposed by the hon. Member for East Northamptonshire was not included in the Bill. It was based upon the unanimous recommendation of the Welsh Land Commission. The recommendation was that wherever a tenant was capriciously evicted—that is to say, received notice to quit his holding for inadequate reasons, or for any other cause than that he had not paid his rent, or that he had persisted in permitting waste, and so forth—the tenant ought to be permitted to claim, in addition to the compensation due under the the Act of 1883, some compensation for disturbance. I regret that that has not been introduced into this Bill. If that clause had been inserted it would have been regarded by the Welsh tenant farmers as a great concession, and we should have been able to say without any reservation that this Bill was indeed a substantial step in advance. It seemed to me that the hon. and learned Gentleman did not deal adequately with the question of mortgagees in possession and of trustees. There are cases in which trustees, owing to their position as trustees, are absolutely bound to do things which, perhaps, if they had sole and unfettered discretion, as individual or private owners would have, they would never dream of doing. I have cases of that kind in my mind, and there are cases also where there are mortgagees in possession; they have none of the social restraints of resident landlords; they may be persons in

the City who do not care two straws about the land or the tenant or anything else other than receiving as much as they possibly can. I venture to think that in cases of that kind, in which great hardship has often been caused not merely to individual tenants, but to large bodies of tenants, some relief might have been given by the Government. It is surely not beyond the resources of statesmanship to find some means by which persons of that kind can be protected against persons who are obliged to act extortionately against their will, or against persons who are in possession as mortgagees and who sometimes act very heartlessly indeed, as we have known in the past. It appears to me that during this Parliament Wales has had less reason to thank Her Majesty's Government than during any preceding Parliament of which I have any recollection. We have made appeal after appeal to the Government of the day for justice to Wales in regard to a large number of questions—not merely the land question alone, but in regard to other questions in which we are interested. We have laid before the Government recommendations of Royal Commissions, presented unanimously by the bodies from which they came, but every one has been rejected. We have asked very little, but we have had from this Government still less. In regard to the great questions in which Wales is interested—and she is interested I would have hon. Members know in different sets of questions from those in which English Members are interested—she has received absolutely nothing at the hands of Her Majesty's Government. We do not vote against this Bill, because we are willing to take whatever crumb may fall from that Table, but we have at all events the right to say that this measure does not meet the needs or the requirements of the Welsh tenant farmers, and that the Welsh representatives in this House will continue to press forward the demands they have hitherto made until those demands are conceded in much larger measure than is the case at present.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

POST OFFICE SITES BILL.

[THIRD READING.]

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid) did not wish to weary the House, but there were two or three points he desired to have on record. He understood that although the Secretary to the Treasury was unable to assent to the striking out of Sub-section 3 of Clause 1, he was prepared to recommend that, as far as possible, the Treasury should pay the local authorities the rates during the demolition of buildings until the post office was built. He further understood that in future the plans should be made accessible to Members of the House. The right hon. Gentleman also promised to give some information as to the persons to be displaced, and it was further understood that the special privileges given to the City Corporation should be extended to the other local authorities affected. As to Clause 9, it would be an improvement if it were omitted altogether, as it was absolutely unnecessary.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (MR. HANBURY, Preston) thought he had satisfied the hon. Member when the Bill was in Committee. He was perfectly ready to give the assurance with regard to the rates. With regard to the number of persons to be displaced, the Standing Order did not apply in London if less than twenty houses were taken. That did not happen under the Bill, as in Whitechapel there were only three and in Southwark fourteen. There was, however, one case in which, if this were an ordinary private Bill, the Standing Order would apply, and that was the case of Bristol. There forty houses were to be taken, thereby dispossessing about 194 occupants. It was not really possible to enforce any such Order on the Crown, but he agreed that it was perfectly right and just that a rule which applied to private bodies should hold good as regarded the Crown in a case of this kind, and the Solicitor to the Post Office agreed with

him that in a case of this kind provision should be made for the people displaced.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

COUNTY COURTS (INVESTMENT OF DEPOSITS) BILL [Lords].

Order for consideration, as amended, read.

MR. CALDWELL pointed out that in Ireland the repayment of deposits might be made by an Order either of the Lord Chancellor or the county court. In England it was by an Order of the Treasury. It was a little strange that the Treasury should be asked to make an Order in a civil matter in regard to which they could do practically nothing. Under the Workmen's Compensation Act there was practically the same subject dealt with, and there the Order was by the Treasury or the county court. That seemed to be the correct form, and it was a pity it was not adhered to in this case.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY had no doubt due weight would be given to the general observations of the hon. Member with regard to the desirability of uniformity.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

LUNACY BOARD (SCOTLAND) (SALARIES, ETC.) BILL.

Order for consideration, as amended, read.

MR. CALDWELL stated that when this Bill was first brought in it proposed to establish an entirely new principle. Five hundred pounds a year was to be paid to men who, by Act of Parliament, were bound to discharge gratuitously, as public officials, the duty for which that payment was proposed to be made. The clause to which exception was taken having been expunged, there was now no objection to the Bill passing.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

OIL IN TOBACCO BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 :—

Question proposed, "That Clause 1 stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Hanbury.

DR. TANNER moved, "That the Chairman do report progress, and ask leave to sit again"; but the Chairman, being of opinion that the motion was an abuse of the rules of the House, declined to propose the Question thereupon to the Committee.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 2 :—

Question proposed, "That Clause 2 stand part of the Bill."

DR. TANNER moved, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again"; but the Chairman, being of opinion that the motion was an abuse of the rules of the House, declined to propose the Question thereupon to the Committee.

Clause agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment; read the third time, and passed.

INEBRIATES AMENDMENT (SCOTLAND) BILL [Lords].

Considered in Committee, and reported, with an Amendment.

Bill considered, as amended; read the third time, and passed, with an Amendment.

DIOCESAN RECORDS BILL [Lords].

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

RAILWAYS (PREVENTION OF ACCIDENTS) BILL.

Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

GREENWICH HOSPITAL.

Resolved, That the Statement of the estimated Income and Expenditure of Greenwich Hospital and Travers' Foundation for the year 1900–1901 be approved. —(*Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*)

In pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th day of this instant July, Mr. Speaker adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at five minutes after Twelve of the clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Friday, 20th July, 1900.

SAT FIRST.

The Earl of Strafford sat first in Parliament after the death of his brother.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with:—

South Wales Electrical Power Distribution.

And also the Certificate that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with:—

London (Marylebone) Provisional Order.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

EXMOUTH URBAN DISTRICT WATER BILL [H.L.].

GWYRFAI RURAL DISTRICT COUNCIL WATER BILL [H.L.].

Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to.

EAST LONDON WATER BILL.

Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

CITY OF LONDON (VARIOUS POWERS) BILL.

The Queen's consent signified; and Bill reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

LONDON AND NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY BILL.

Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

LONDON UNITED TRAMWAYS BILL.

Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

BLACKPOOL, ST. ANNE'S, AND LYTHAM TRAMWAYS BILL.

Reported, with Amendments.

WANDSWORTH AND PUTNEY GAS BILL.

Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

ABERDEEN POLICE AND IMPROVEMENT BILL.

Reported, with Amendments.

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL (MONEY) BILL.

EXETER CORPORATION BILL.

KINGSCOURT, KEADY, AND ARMAGH RAILWAY BILL.

Reported, with Amendments.

GREAT INDIAN PENINSULA RAILWAY COMPANY BILL.

Reported, without amendment.

DURHAM (COUNTY OF) ELECTRIC POWER SUPPLY BILL.

LANCASHIRE ELECTRIC POWER BILL.

Moved, That the Order made on the 12th day of March last, "That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after Tuesday the 26th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bills be now read 2^a; agreed to; and Bills read 2^a accordingly.

MIDLAND GREAT WESTERN RAILWAY OF IRELAND BILL [H.L.].

Read 3^a, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

DEARNE VALLEY RAILWAY BILL [H.L.].

Returned from the Commons agreed to.

GLYNCORRWG URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL GAS BILL [H.L.].

LONDON SEA WATER SUPPLY BILL [H.L.].

Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments.

WHITECHAPEL AND BOW RAILWAY BILL [H.L.].

Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

GREAT SOUTHERN AND WESTERN AND WATERFORD, LIMERICK, AND WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANIES AMALGAMATION BILL [H.L.].

GREAT SOUTHERN AND WESTERN AND WATERFORD AND CENTRAL IRELAND RAILWAY COMPANIES AMALGAMATION BILL [H.L.].

Reported from the Joint Committee, with Amendments.

GREAT SOUTHERN AND WESTERN AND WATERFORD, LIMERICK, AND WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANIES AMALGAMATION BILL [H.L.].

MIDLAND GREAT WESTERN RAILWAY OF IRELAND BILL [H.L.].

GREAT SOUTHERN AND WESTERN AND WATERFORD AND CENTRAL IRELAND RAILWAY COMPANIES AMALGAMATION BILL [H.L.].

Report from the Joint Committee (with the proceedings of the Committee) made, and to be printed. (No. 196.)

EDINBURGH (HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES) IMPROVEMENT SCHEME PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL. (No. 201.)

PAISLEY WATERWORKS PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL. (No. 202.)

Brought from the Commons, read 1^a; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners.

LONDON (ST. LUKE) PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

LONDON (SOUTHWARK) PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

House in Committee (according to Order); Bills reported without amendment; Standing Committee negatived; and Bills to be read 3^a on Monday next.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 3) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDERS (HOUSING OF WORKING CLASSES) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDERS (HOUSING OF WORKING CLASSES) (No. 2) BILL.

Read 3^a (according to Order), and passed.

GAS ORDERS CONFIRMATION (No. 1) BILL [H.L.].

Commons Amendments considered (according to Order), and agreed to.

DUBLIN CORPORATION BILL.

CLONTARF URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL BILL.

Report from the Joint Committee that the said Bills ought to be allowed to proceed; the proceedings of the Select Committee laid upon the Table, and to be printed. (No. 204.)

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of a light railway in the counties of Devon and Cornwall from Bere Alston Station to Calstock, and the working of a portion of the East Cornwall Mineral Railway as a light railway.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION.

Forty-fourth Report of Her Majesty's Civil Service Commissioners; with Appendix.

PUBLIC RECORDS (IRELAND).

Thirty-second Report of the Deputy Keeper of the Records.

AGRARIAN OUTRAGES (IRELAND).

Return for the quarter ended 30th June, 1900.

TRADE REPORTS—ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 2479. Argentine Republic (Agricultural and commercial condition).
No. 2480. Argentine Republic (Buenos Ayres).
No. 2481. Chile.
No. 2482. Greece (Finances).
No. 2483. Austria-Hungary.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION ACT, 1889.

Minute by the Board of Education sanctioning the subjects to be taught under Clause 8 of the Act, for the county of Middlesex (fifth minute). Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

RAILWAYS (PREVENTION OF ACCIDENTS) BILL.

Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

INEBRIATES AMENDMENT (SCOTLAND) BILL [H.L.].

Returned from the Commons agreed to, with an Amendment; the said Amendment to be printed, and to be considered on Tuesday next. (No. 194.)

COUNTY COURTS (INVESTMENT OF DEPOSITS) BILL [H.L.].

Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments; the said Amendments to be printed. (No. 195.)

AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS BILL.

Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª on Tuesday next (The Lord Privy Seal [*V. Cross.*]) (No. 197.)

LUNACY BOARD (SCOTLAND) SALARIES, ETC.) BILL.

Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª on Tuesday next (The Lord Balfour). (No. 198.)

OIL IN TOBACCO BILL.

Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; and to be printed. (No. 199.)

POST OFFICE SITES BILL.

Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners. (No. 200.)

COUNTY AND BOROUGH FRANCHISE ASSIMILATION (LONDON) BILL.

House in Committee (according to Order); Bill reported without amendment; and re-committed to the Standing Committee.

TOWN COUNCILS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

House in Committee (according to Order).

Clause 4:—

*THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Lord BALFOUR of BURLEIGH): It is not quite certain to what burghs of barony and burghs of regality the Bill would apply, and the object of the Amendment standing in my name is to make it clear that it does not apply to any burghs which are not included in the Burgh Police (Scotland) Act, 1892.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 4, page 1, line 24, to leave out from 'burgh of regality' to end of clause, and to insert 'police burgh and any other burgh within the meaning of the Burgh Police (Scotland) Act, 1892, to which that Act applied from its commencement.'"—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 4, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 5 to 8 agreed to.

Clause 9:—

*LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH. This clause provides the method by which burghs may sue and be sued, and the Amendment standing in my name makes it possible to sue in other ways and not to force them back on this clause. It is a matter of agreement, and I do not think there will be any opposition.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 9, page 3, line 36, to leave out 'shall' and to insert 'may.'"—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 9, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 10 to 12 agreed to.

Clause 13:—

*LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH: This clause deals with the reasons which may disqualify a man from retaining his seat as a councillor. Sub-section (*a*) provides that a person shall not be disqualified by reason only of his having any share or interest in any lease, feu, sale, or purchase of land, or any agreement for the same. Some of the Scottish burghs have large property which is known as the Common Good, and owing to the absence of a disqualification such as this in the early days of the century a good deal of the property of the burgh was made use of. I think it is better that these words should not remain in the clause, and that if a man has a lease of land from the burgh it should disqualify him for a seat.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 13, page 5, line 20, to leave out Sub-section (*a*)."—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 13, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 14 :—

*LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH: I have thought it better to delete the greater portion of this clause, and to substitute words which, in the opinion of my Department, are clearer and preferable as a matter of drafting, rather than attempt to amend the clause as it stands. I do not think there will be any opposition to the Amendment, which gives burgh councils more power to declare as to the way in which a seat shall be vacated.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 14, page 5, line 38, to leave out from end of line to end of clause, and to insert 'until (1) he voluntarily resigns; or (2) his disqualification has been determined by an election court under and within the meaning of the Elections (Scotland) (Corrupt and Illegal Practices) Act, 1890, on a petition presented within the time specified by said Act, by the town council or by any four or more electors, or, in the case of disqualification alleged to exist at the time of nomination or election, by any candidate opposing him at the election, provided that the last-mentioned Act shall be held to apply to the said petition and procedure thereon, provided that in the case of any continuing disqualification it shall be competent to present such petition at any time while the disqualification subsists; and provided also that if in the opinion of the election court any disqualified person has in the knowledge of his disqualification made an oath or declaration *de fideli*, or taken his seat in the town council, it shall be in the power of the Court to impose on him a fine not exceeding one hundred pounds, which fine shall be paid to the town council, and applied in such manner as they may direct; or (3) a resolution declaring his office vacant has been passed by the town council at a meeting of which notice shall be given to the councillor in question and to the other councillors of the burgh at least three days before the date of such meeting; provided that the said councillor shall be entitled to appeal against any such resolution by lodging a note of appeal within fourteen days after the date of such resolution in manner provided by Section 339 of the Burgh Police (Scotland) Act, 1892; and provided, further, that no such appeal shall entitle the said councillor to vote and act as a councillor while the same is pending."—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 14, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 15 to 22 agreed to.

Clause 23 :—

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: I beg to move the Amendment standing in the name of my noble friend the Marquess of Huntly, the object of which is to place persons who are ratepayers within Royal burghs on exactly the same footing as ratepayers who reside within police burghs.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 23, page 8, line 10, after 'another' to insert 'or their residing more than seven miles beyond some part of the municipal boundary.'"—(*The Earl of Camperdown.*)

*LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH: I am prepared to accept this Amendment. It is an entirely proper one, and does not in any way touch the Parliamentary franchise. It gets rid of an anomaly which has caused a great deal of hardship, and I accept it on the condition that if it is objected to in another place—I hope it will not be, but it is quite possible—in such a way as to imperil the Bill, I shall not be considered bound to stand by it.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 23, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 24 to 35 agreed to.

Clause 36 :—

*LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH: This clause deals with casual vacancies. It is the custom in Scotland for casual vacancies in town councils to be filled up by co-optation, but it is thought that when they occur at the beginning of the municipal year, immediately after an election has taken place, they should be filled by a new election. The Amendment standing in my name gives power for such a procedure to be adopted.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 36, page 12, line 18, at end of clause to insert 'provided that any vacancy so occurring may, if the town council so resolve, be filled up *ad interim* as soon as may be by a special election by the electors, and such election shall be held as nearly as may be under the provisions of this Act, and the returning officer at such election shall, subject to the approval of the town council, fix the date of the election, and shall fix the dates for the issue of all necessary notices and for lodging and withdrawing nomination papers, so that the intervals between such respective dates shall be the same as in the case of ordinary elections under this Act.'"—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 36, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 37 to 60 agreed to.

Clause 61 :—

*LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH: This clause provides that in the event of the provost being prevented at any time from fulfilling, or failing to fulfil, any of the duties of his office on account of illness, absence from home, or from attendance at any meeting or any other cause, such duty shall be performed by the senior bailie. The clause as it stands is, however, too wide, as it would put the senior bailie on all the committees and trusts of which the provost is a member. The object of my Amendments is to limit the business for which the senior bailie should act in the absence of the provost simply to municipal affairs.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 61, page 17, line 31, after 'office' to insert 'under this Act or the Burgh Police (Scotland) Act, 1892.'"—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 61, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 62 to 87, agreed to.

Clause 88 :—

*LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH: This clause deals with the case of an official of a burgh who has made away with the funds, and provides that the deficiency shall be charged against the particular rate to which the funds belong, which are the matter of his misconduct. It is obviously a right clause.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 88, page 24, line 25, after 'levied' to insert 'or funds managed.'"—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 88, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 89 to 101 agreed to.

Clause 102 :—

*LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH: I propose to add a proviso to this clause for the sake of making sure that we are preserving the existing law in certain burghs whose council have the power of appointing one of their number as dean of guild.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 102, page 29, line 10, at end of clause to insert 'and in any burgh where under the existing law it has been the custom of the town council to appoint a councillor to perform the duties and functions formerly performed by the dean of guild in such council, or in any dean of guild court of such burgh, the council may continue to make such an appointment, and the whole provisions of this Act relating to the appointment, tenure, vacating office, and supply of vacancies applicable to a bailie shall be applicable to the councillor so appointed.'"—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 102, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 103 to 108 agreed to.

Clause 109 amended, and agreed to.

Clauses 110 to 115 agreed to.

*LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH: I now move a new clause to make sure that the rights of counties in certain properties which they have, such as waterworks and the like, shall not be affected by this Bill. I am myself not quite clear that the clause is required, but two or three of the counties in Scotland have made representations that unless this clause is inserted they will run the risk of being deprived of their property, and on the whole I think it is wise to insert the clause.

Amendment moved—

"To insert as a new clause, 'Nothing in this Act contained shall affect the rights, powers, or authorities of any county council or district committee of a county council or local authority of a county or a district of a county under the Public Health (Scotland) Act, 1897; or prejudice the provisions of Sub-sections 1 and 2 of Section 81 of the Local Government (Scotland) Act, 1889, as amended by Section 44 of the Local Government (Scotland) Act, 1894.'"—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

New Clause agreed to.

Bill re-committed to the Standing Committee; and to be printed as amended. (No. 203.)

INDIAN EXPENDITURE—REPORT OF THE ROYAL COMMISSION.

THE EARL OF NORTHBROOK: My Lords, I rise to call attention to the Report of the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure; to ask Her Majesty's Government whether they propose to accept the recommendations of the Commission; and to move for copies of any correspondence between the Secretary of State for India in Council and the Treasury on the subject. The terms of reference to the Royal Commission were that they were to inquire into the administration and management of the military and civil expenditure incurred under the authority of the Secretary of State for India in Council, or of the Government of India, and the apportionment of charge between the Governments of the United Kingdom and of India for purposes in which both are interested. I, however, propose to confine my remarks to-day to the second head of the order of reference—namely, the apportionment of charge between the two Governments, and of that apportionment almost entirely to the charge on account of Her Majesty's forces serving in India. The history of this question is rather a sad one. For twenty-five years successive Governors General of India in Council and successive Secretaries of State for India in Council have protested against what they considered to be the excessive charge which has been put upon the revenues of India on account of Her Majesty's forces serving in that country, but with little or no result. They protested against these charges under two heads—firstly, on the pure arithmetical calculations upon which the charges were founded; and, secondly, on the ground that certain equitable considerations which ought to have been taken into account in settling how much India ought to pay had not been so taken into account. Twenty years ago I was asked to preside over a small Commission to inquire into the subject. I had the assistance of two able and distinguished public servants—Sir Thomas Seccombe, of the India Office, and Sir Ralph Knox, of the War Office—and the Government, in appointing that Commission, undoubtedly intended, judging from the words Mr. Stanhope used in the House of Commons, that we should settle the whole of this vexed question. after sitting ten years we determined unanimously what the charge to be paid by India should be on the arithmetical basis, and the result of our work was a reduction of the charges against India of £1,000,000 sterling. We then approached the question of the equitable considerations, and requested that we should know what was the opinion of the Government of India on the subject. We asked the noble Viscount the present Lord Privy Seal (Viscount Cross), who was then Secretary of State for India, to confer with India, and in March, 1890, my noble friend the Marquess of Lansdowne, who was then Governor General, sent an elaborate despatch home giving in full the opinions of the Government of India in respect to the equitable considerations which should be taken into account by the English Government in fixing these charges. I may mention, as somewhat important, that Lord Roberts was then Commander-in-Chief in India, and therefore the opinion of the Government of India came fortified by the opinion also of Lord Roberts, than whom no man is more capable of giving an opinion upon the question. That despatch was not communicated to the Commission over which I presided till the autumn of 1891, more than twelve months after its receipt in this country, and then it was sent accompanied by two letters—one from the Secretary of State for War stating that, although not objecting to the despatch being sent us for consideration, he was not prepared to accept our opinion upon the matter; and the other from the Treasury, stating that the Chancellor of the Exchequer was also not prepared to accept any opinion which the Commission might express on this despatch. That, of course, put any consideration by us of the equitable claims of India out of the question. I declined to proceed with the matter, and so far as my Commission was concerned the matter dropped. I had some communication at that time with the then Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Goschen, and I suggested that a different kind of body should be formed to take these matters into consideration. There was, however, as your Lordships know, a change of Government in 1892, and nothing was done till 1895, when Sir Henry Fowler, then Secretary of State for India, appointed the Commission to the Report of which I now beg to call your Lordships' attention. That is the history of this question. I think it is

unfortunate that Sir Henry Fowler, in appointing the Commission, overweighted it by adding the obligation to inquire into the whole question of Indian expenditure. They had to go into very minute statistics from the year 1860, and it is no wonder that they were two years taking evidence and three years more making their Report. My noble friend Lord Welby has been blamed for the length of time which the Commission took in making their Report; but it must be remembered that they had to master all the details of the financial machinery of the Government of India in England and India, as well as the progress of expenditure during the last forty years. I now come to the Report of the Commission. There was a Report signed by a minority of three—Sir William Wedderburn, Bart., Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, and Mr. W. S. Caine, which I have read with attention; but I will confine myself to the Report of the majority, and it is interesting to consider of whom the ten members composing it consisted. The Chairman, Lord Welby, is well known to your Lordships as having for a great many years occupied with great ability and distinction the office of Permanent Secretary of the Treasury, and has been rightly placed in the position he now occupies in your Lordships' House in consequence of that distinguished service. The next member was Mr. Leonard H. Courtney, who, as your Lordships know, was a very able and distinguished Secretary of the Treasury. The next was Mr. W. L. Jackson, who was also a very distinguished Secretary of the Treasury. The majority also included Sir E. W. Hamilton, at present a very high Treasury official; Sir Ralph Knox, Under Secretary for War; Sir James Peile, a distinguished member of the Indian Council; Sir Andrew Scoble, who was also connected with India; Mr. G. L. Ryder, a gentleman holding high office in the Treasury; and Mr. Buchanan and Mr. (now Sir) Robert Mowbray, two independent Members of Parliament. Your Lordships will see that no less than five out of the ten members who signed the Report of the Majority were either actually serving or had served in the Treasury; one was actually serving in the War Office; only two had any connection with India, and there were two independent Members of Parliament. It is to be noted that two members of the Commission, Sir Ralph Knox and Mr. Ryder, prepared the case of the War Office in answer to that which was laid before the Commission on the part of the Secretary of State for India in Council. Although the constitution of the Commission might be taken exception to on behalf of India, I take no such exception. I am perfectly satisfied with the impartiality and ability of those who served; but at any rate the English Government cannot say that there was any bias in favour of India in the composition of the Majority. Moreover, the two independent members of the Commission — Mr. Buchanan and Sir Robert Mowbray—made additional Reports, which were more favourable to India than the Report of the Majority. The main recommendations of the Report were, first, a plan for settling any questions which might in future arise as to the charge for troops, English or Indian, lent by either Government to the other. I will not go into the details of that plan, but it seem to me to be a very reasonable one, and likely to prevent the recurrence of those unfortunate disputes which have taken place between the two Governments on former occasions. There is, however, one difficulty in regard to this. It is easy enough to lay down certain cases in which there could be no direct and substantial interest to India on the one hand, or to this country on the other; but when it comes to be a question of doubt the point is, who is to decide the question? The noble Viscount opposite, Viscount Cross, when he was Secretary for India, and Sir Henry Fowler, when he held a similar position, came to the conclusion that the decision might be left to the two Governments respectively. But other high authorities, including, I believe, the noble Marquess the Prime Minister, think this would not be a proper arrangement. The second recommendation was a plan for settling smaller matters of dispute by arbitration before some judicial authority who would decide after hearing both sides. I am not particular as to what arrangement is made. What I do hope is that some plan based upon these two recommendations of the Commission will be accepted by the Government in order that these disputes may be put an end to. Your Lordships must know how unfortunate it has been that educated natives in India, who are studying these questions, should

find that the Governors General, the Secretaries of State, and other high authorities have constantly asserted that India has been treated unjustly in these matters, and that no reasonable answer can be produced on the other side. The third recommendation of the Commission was that the arithmetical arrangement which was settled by the Commission over which I presided—£7 10s. per effective man—should be maintained. I trust that this will be accepted by the Government. The fourth subject is the equitable pleas raised on behalf of India, and these mainly depend on Lord Lansdowne's despatch of 25th March, 1890, to which I have referred. The summary of that despatch, given in Lord Lansdowne's evidence before the Commission, was that—

"Indian foreign policy is really determined by Imperial rather than by Indian considerations."

and—

"The Indian Army serves for Imperial as well as for Indian purposes."

As regards the first plea what better authority can there be than that of Lord Lansdowne in his despatch, which is signed also by Lord Roberts? He said—

"Millions of money have been spent on increasing the Army of India, on armaments and fortifications, to provide for the security of India, not against domestic enemies, or to prevent the incursions of the warlike people of adjoining countries, but to maintain the supremacy of British power in the East. The scope of all these great and costly measures reaches far beyond Indian limits, and the policy which dictates them is an Imperial policy. We claim, therefore, that in the maintenance of the British forces in this country a just and even liberal view should be taken of the charges which should legitimately be made against Indian revenues."

That opinion, given on the authority of Lord Lansdowne and his Council, of which Lord Roberts was a member, seems to me to settle that matter, and I do not find in the Report of the Commission any sufficient answer to this plea. The second plea—namely, that the Indian Army serves for Imperial as well as for Indian purposes—it is hardly necessary to argue in view of the fact that Indian forces are now engaged in South Africa and in China. I hear that the Secretary of State for India stated to-day in another place that 20,000 men in all have left India either for the Cape of Good Hope or for China. The Commission suggested that these two pleas should be considered when the capitation rate is revised, but they recommended in the meantime an immediate and substantial relief to the revenues of India of about £300,000 a year. Speaking for myself, I wish that the question could have been finally settled, but I think those who have been urging the question may be content by seeing their main arguments accepted. For my part I am quite ready to accept the Report of the Commission as I should any other arbitration, but with the reservation that India should receive proper consideration for the great delay in the settlement of her claims. I believe that in arbitrations the date for the payment of the award is usually fixed in regard to the date at which the matter in dispute could have been settled if both parties had exercised reasonable diligence in bringing forward their cases—no one can say that India has been in default in this respect. But the Treasury had Lord Lansdowne's despatch stating India's case before them in 1890, and the question might have been settled in 1893. Now it cannot be settled before 1901, and therefore I contend that the award, on all equitable principles, should take effect from 1893. I do not think it is too much to ask that eight years arrears of this £300,000 should be paid. It is a mere trifle. Those eight years of arrears amount to £2,400,000, and if £2,400,000 of the Indian debt was taken over by this country it would only create a charge of about £66,000 a year upon the British Exchequer. I hope Her Majesty's Government may be able to give your Lordships' House an assurance that at last equitable treatment will be given to India in this long-standing controversy, and that it will be announced at once. The condition of the finances of India must be very serious owing to the famine, and if some such treatment as I have suggested is carried out by the Government I feel sure that it will be exceedingly well received in India.

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for copies of any correspondence between the Secretary of State for India in Council and the Treasury on the subject of the Report of the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure."—(*The Earl of Northbrook.*)

LORD WELBY: My Lords, I am very glad indeed that this question should have fallen into the hands of my noble friend, for not only has it fallen into the hands of a noble Lord whose authority on Indian matters is second to none, but, if I may say so without presumption, it has fallen into the hands of one whose government of India is marked as a model of prudent and wise financial administration. I am pleased to hear my noble friend support the recommendations of the Commission. I feel that the fact that Lord Northbrook endorses and supports those recommendations will have great weight with Her Majesty's Government. The Commission over which I had the honour to preside, like most Commissions, was not unanimous, but I think I can show your Lordships that on the practical points which are now under consideration the Commission was unanimous. It is often the case that in questions connected with the immense Empire of India, men who take a keen interest in the claims and in the needs of India sometimes forget the claims of the British taxpayer. The opinions of these gentlemen are entitled to every consideration, but for practical purposes we must endeavour to hold a just balance between the claims of the Indian taxpayer and the claims of the British taxpayer. The minority of the Commission, so far as the recommendations go to which Lord Northbrook has alluded, far from differing from them, endorsed them, their only complaint being that they did not go far enough. Therefore, I think I may venture to say that, in regard to these particular recommendations, the Commissioners were unanimous. The noble Lord has alluded to the somewhat wide scope of the terms of reference to the Commission, and I venture to trouble your Lordships with one or two remarks upon that point. It is a matter of great interest to Parliament to know that on an independent inquiry a favourable verdict has been given upon the financial administration of the Indian Empire during the period since it came under the direct control of Her Majesty. That period divides itself into two parts. There is, first of all, the period from 1861, the time when financial equilibrium was restored, to 1884. Before that time the taxes of India were largely increased to meet the demands of the Mutiny, but at the end of that period I think it may be said that they had fallen to the level of the taxes before the Mutiny broke out. That was the result of remarkable economy both in regard to civil and military administration. The history of financial administration in India between 1861 and 1884 was very remarkable, and is paralleled in very few countries in the world. I now come to the second period—that from 1884 to 1896. I stop at 1896 on account of the famine that followed. From 1884 to 1896, owing to the fall in exchange and the demands for military expenditure, the taxation which had been remitted was reimposed. It should, however, be mentioned that, but for the fall in exchange, the natural growth of the Indian revenue was so satisfactory that after the increased demands for military expenditure had been met there would have been left a considerable surplus applicable to the reduction of debt. In following out this review the Commissioners were struck by the satisfactory natural growth of revenue, showing, on the whole, a healthy state of things in the Empire; but it appeared to us that the increase was not more that might naturally be expected in the case of a growing Empire. I come next to the most important question of debt. The debt of India at the close of the Mutiny was what is called an unproductive debt. In the interval between the Mutiny and the date to which I have carried the review—namely, 1896—not only did the growth of that unproductive debt entirely cease—a great contrast to the closing twenty years of the administration of the East India Company, when the debt increased by leaps and bounds—but before 1896 that debt had been reduced by 25 per cent., although in the interval expenditure of no less than £23,000,000 had been incurred in war and in those famine demands which are, in a sense, unproductive. Therefore, I submit that the result of the financial administration of India since India passed under the direct control of Her Majesty is such as should give satisfaction to Parliament. Further than that, the Indian Government class certain of their services under the head of commercial services which do earn a revenue. On each of these heads the Commission was able to report that the result was fairly satisfactory. The Post Office and the Telegraph have both become paying branches, and when we came to the large expenditure on irrigation we were able to report that that very

large system of works, which is of immense importance to India at all times, does not impose any charge whatever on the Indian taxpayers. Passing on to the railways, I think the result is very remarkable. Although the manner in which the accounts are drawn does not show the figures favourably for a commercial result, the Commission found that, if the cost of military lines and lines simply made for famine protection, which ought to be carried to a separate account, were deducted, the commercial railways of India were paying their way, and that the Indian people had the benefit of them without a farthing of burden being placed on the present taxpayers. The Commission came to the conclusion that the financial machinery was sound, well organised, and effectively controlled. The Commission, as my noble friend informed your Lordships, did not come to its inquiry with any foregone conclusion in favour of India. It was composed largely of officials, and officials are conscious of one another's infirmities. The Report of the Commission deserves weight because it is unbiassed and unprejudiced. During the forty years that India has been under the rule of Her Majesty, her financial administration has been entrusted to faithful stewards. The system under which the finances of India are administered is sound, and one in which the Parliament may fairly have confidence. We ventured to call the attention of Her Majesty to two points: one of them was the large growth of the non-effective service. The Commission, however, pronounced no opinion upon it, knowing well that in the case of a tropical climate the non-effective service must naturally be heavy; but the growth of this service did strike us as serious, and we considered that the Indian Government ought to subject the regulations relating to that service to careful actuarial examination, so that the public might be assured that there was no extravagance. I hope the recommendations of the Commission, so far as they come from the majority, will have the favourable attention of Her Majesty's Government. I go considerably further in one respect. I do not think the audit system of India will ever be complete or perfect until the independence of the Comptroller and Auditor General is completely established. The chief desire of the Commission was to remove all plausible, or perhaps even good, grounds for complaint on the part of India. On one point we were met by the fact that the Imperial Government pays, without asking any return from the Colonies, the whole cost of the Colonial Office. I do not think the India Office is on all fours with the Colonial Office, but I think the India Office can fairly consider that they are not treated the same as the Colonies if not a farthing is contributed by the Imperial Exchequer to the cost of the India Office. I think it is desirable to remove any such impression which should arise in the minds of the people. I need not enter at length into many of the other points. I think we were justified in recommending that the Imperial Government should pay half the cost of the garrison of Aden. If ever the Empire was organised as a whole, Aden would be an Imperial fortress to which the whole Empire would contribute. That being the case, it is only right that half the military charge of Aden should be borne by the Imperial Exchequer. In regard to one point we entered upon a rather adventurous course. We put ourselves up to be criticised by attempting to suggest geographical limits within which India might have a separate and distinct interest in military expeditions, and the Commission deserve a certain amount of credit for their boldness if for nothing else. I think a very great end will be gained, and every reason will be given for India to be satisfied, if it is provided that the Imperial Government will not impose a contribution on India except with the assent of India, or until the previous assent of Parliament had been obtained. There is one other subject to which I, as an old Treasury official, attach the greatest importance — namely, that of putting an end to administrative disputes. I know of no other method by which they can be put an end to except by the appointment of an unbiassed and unprejudiced man, in whom both parties have confidence — a man of judicial rank —who should hear both sides and give a decision which should be final. I think both parties would accept that decision, and it would have this further advantage, that the two parties would agree without going to arbitration unless they had a very good case. Although the recommendations of the Commission fall short in many respects of the desires of the Indian Government, and certainly of the people of India, their adoption would go far to remove just grounds of

complaint, and grants such as are recommended, which are based upon reasons and are in their nature to a great extent permanent, would be of greater value than those occasional and spasmodic grants which Her Majesty's Government are asked to make in cases of pressure.

THE EARL OF ONSLOW: The noble Lord who has just sat down commenced his observations by expressing his gratification that this subject has fallen into the hands of the noble Earl who called attention to it, and who has had so very wide an experience of the administration of Indian affairs. I wish to associate myself entirely with the noble Lord in those remarks, and I would even go further and say that it appears to me that the evidence which was given by the noble Earl before the Commission, has led to perhaps the most valuable part of the Report which your Lordships are now considering. The noble Lord expressed the hope that Her Majesty's Government would accept the Report as the decision of a competent and a judicial tribunal. So far at any rate as that part of it is concerned which deals with the history of the finances and the administration of India, I have no complaints whatever to make, and I certainly am prepared to accept entirely the opinions which they arrived at. The Commission also expressed their opinion that the general administration of India is not expensive —that law and justice in India are self-supporting, and that the non-effective expenditure upon pensions and upon furlough pay, etc., is not excessive as compared with that upon Imperial and diplomatic services, and similar services rendered in our more important Crown Colonies. I think the Commission might even have gone further; they might have said that perhaps there is no country in the world, considering the vast extent of its area and of its population, which is as economically administered as is the Government of India. The noble Earl who moved the resolution complained that the reference to the Commission perhaps somewhat overweighted them. The noble Earl the Secretary of State for War a few years ago expressed to your Lordships his opinion that most Royal Commissions appointed in this country in their proceedings were guided with great care and with great deliberation. I certainly cannot say that anything but the utmost care has been devoted by this Commission to the consideration of this Report. I think they took evidence for upwards of two years, and they were something like three years in considering what should be their Report. If it took that Commission five years to consider and report upon the reference which was submitted to them, I do not think your Lordships will think Her Majesty's Government wholly unreasonable if they say that they have not been able to consider the whole of that Report in all its bearings in the three years since it was presented. It has seemed to us, and I think the noble Earl will agree with me, that the most important point in the Report of that Commission is upon the question of the apportionment of charge between the Imperial Government and the Indian Government, and it is to that question that Her Majesty's Government have in the first place devoted their attention. They have not as yet carefully considered the suggestion which is made for the purpose of a reference to settle all questions of the payment for Indian troops when they are employed beyond the frontiers of India; they have not considered in detail the suggestion that a tribunal of arbitration should be established to consider questions of difference between the Government of India and the Imperial Government, and between the India Office, the War Office, the Treasury, and the other Departments of State with which the India Office are brought into communication. But all those matters are receiving very careful attention, and I will go thus far—I will say that I agree entirely with the noble Lord the chairman of the Commission that the publication and the knowledge which is brought to the people of India that there are going on in England disputes and discussions between the public offices is, as the noble Lord describes it, little short of a scandal. We in this country thoroughly understand what is the meaning of a dispute between two Departments of the Government—each Department is naturally doing the best for its own views and its own interests; but it does not commend itself in that light to the people of India. They are led away by the impression that the Imperial Government is trying to take an advantage and to deal illiberally with the people of India. That, I quite agree with the noble Lord, is something which we

ought to do all that we can to diminish if not to put an end to altogether. Now, my Lords, what are the points upon which these differences of opinion arise? They are, for the most part, in connection with those undertakings of the Imperial Government in which India is supposed to have, and I think has, an interest, whether it is direct and substantial or whether it is only a comparatively small interest—they are questions in which India undoubtedly is to some extent interested. For example, the noble Lord will recollect that the Government of India agrees to pay a contribution towards the expenditure on our consular and diplomatic service in China. It agrees to pay a contribution towards the consular and diplomatic service in Persia. It agrees to pay a subsidy towards the cable which runs from Zanzibar to Mauritius, and there are certain other small consular services to which the Government of India makes contribution. Those are the most frequent cases of friction between the Departments in this country, and I for one should have been more glad if the Commission could have seen their way to make some suggestion which would enable us to get rid altogether of these subjects of difference which are constantly arising between the Departments at home; and I cannot help hoping that when we are able to give full consideration to this Report we may see some way in which we may avoid these disputes in the future. Then the noble Earl drew your Lordships' attention to certain other charges which are laid upon the Government of India, and he expressed a hope that Her Majesty's Government might in every case refer those to arbitration. I think he suggested that it should be a judicial arbitration carried on by one of Her Majesty's judges. The noble Earl on the Woolsack may have something to say upon that. I am not sure whether he would be disposed to hold that the functions of the judges should be extended to such cases as that. But I may point out to your Lordships that, although we have not called in the services of any of Her Majesty's judges, we have called in the services of several very distinguished Members of this House and of the other House to consider and to arbitrate on differences which have arisen between the Departments. For example, the noble Earl the late Prime Minister, Lord Rosebery, took into consideration the question of the apportionment of the charge for Her Majesty's Navy in Indian waters, and he came to the conclusion that for ten years at least £117,000 was a proper contribution for India to make. The noble Earl the Chairman of Committees in this House—who, although he is not a judge, has, I think all your Lordships will agree, a judicial mind—was good enough to consider what should be the amount that should be paid by the Indian Government towards the mail service between this country and India, and for at least five years that question has been removed from any possibility of conflict between the two authorities. Her Majesty's Government are quite prepared to extend the principle of arbitration. I do not think that we could go quite as far as I understood the noble Earl to wish—namely, that there should be a permanent tribunal.

LORD WELBY: I did not suggest that.

THE EARL OF ONSLOW: As I understand, the noble Earl says he did not suggest that. At any rate I can say that the Government agree with the noble Earl in the desire to refer as far as possible all the larger questions of dispute which may arise between the Imperial Government and the Government of India to competent arbitration. Then, my Lords, the noble Lord who presided over the Commission whose Report your Lordships are considering expressed his opinion—which is to be found in the Report of the minority, and which I know he holds very strongly—that it is desirable that the practice of auditing in India should be assimilated to the practice of auditing in England. The recommendation was not one to which the noble Lord was able to secure the adherence of all his colleagues, and as it has not been put forward with the weight which would attach to the names of the majority of that Commission I cannot hold out any hope to him that Her Majesty's Government will give it very serious or very favourable consideration. I should, perhaps, point out to the noble Lord, though he is probably aware of it already, that in India the audit is carried on continuously; the Comptroller and Auditor General's officials are in every department, they can check and disallow any item which in

their opinion ought not to be charged, it is recoverable immediately, and the charge comes home for the sanction of the Secretary of State in the course of a very short time; and, in addition to that, it is the practice in India to carry on a test audit, which I think the noble Lord himself admits in the Report is of very great value, and a test audit, as your Lordships know, is a practice which does not obtain in England.

LORD WELBY: I think it does.

THE EARL OF ONSLOW: I am content at any rate to rely upon the Report of the majority of the Commission that the sufficiency of the audit in India is not questioned by them, and that they consider it to be well organised and efficient. The whole gist and sum, I may say, of the contentions of the Government of India to which the noble Earl has referred during the time when the noble Earl, now the Secretary of State for War, was Viceroy of India, was that India is entitled to liberal treatment at the hands of Her Majesty's Government and the Imperial Parliament—liberal treatment in the apportionment of the charges between the Governments; and I think I understood the noble Earl to say that in his opinion the capitation grant of £7 10s. is one to which he is not prepared to demur. I think his only point was that when the question of the capitation grant comes to be revised he would plead for liberal treatment for India at the hands of Her Majesty's Government. I have nothing to say in opposition to either of those propositions. My Lords, the resources of India are not small. India in the past has been a very wealthy community. Its people individually may be poor, but its revenues are large. The times have to a large extent altered, and at the present moment India is labouring under a series of calamities which enlist the sympathies not only of every member of your Lordships' House, but of everybody in this country and throughout the Empire. Her Majesty's Government are as much alive to this as any other members of the community, and I can assure the noble Earl and the noble Lord who presided over the Commission that Her Majesty's Government do intend to accept the recommendations of the noble Lord as regards the amount which, in their opinion, ought to be contributed by the Imperial Government towards the revenues of India. That amount is, I think, £293,000, but the noble Lord will pardon me if I point out to him that his Commission made an error which somewhat vitiates those figures. They have in estimating half the cost of the maintenance of the establishments at Aden put it down at £108,000. Now the moiety, as a matter of fact, is Rx.108,000. Well, the good old days when ten rupees were equal to a sovereign, unfortunately, are days that are bygone, and at the present rate of exchange the noble Lord will see that that Rx.108,000 ought to be £72,000, reducing the total amount which the noble Lord thought ought to be contributed by Imperial revenues to Indian revenues to £257,000. Now, my Lords, I am not prepared to pledge myself to the particular items and the particular heads under which the noble Lord wished that this contribution should be made. This I can say on the part of Her Majesty's Government, that they are willing to accept the recommendations of the noble Lord's Commission, and to give at least £250,000, and probably more, towards the relief of the revenues of India. I trust that this will meet with the approval of the noble Earl, and show him that Her Majesty's Government are desirous of meting out not only equitable treatment but liberal treatment to India, and if he will give us time I hope that we shall be able to go a long way towards meeting the other recommendations which have been so ably put forward by the Commission of which the noble Lord was the chairman.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: My Lords, I have no desire to keep the House whilst I make anything like a detailed examination of this very interesting Report. With regard to the large portion of it which relates to the past expenditure and management of finance in India I can only echo what has been said by others. I think it must be extremely satisfactory to all those connected with Indian affairs to see that a Commission composed largely of what I may call British Treasury experts have pronounced so complete an encomium on the management of the finance and expenditure of India. That I think is a very valuable thing to have effected. But, my Lords, I would rather to-night deal with some of the other parts of this Report. I admit

at once that I do not think it at all unreasonable that, after the Commission having taken five years to produce this Report, Her Majesty's Government should have a reasonable time to consider how they should act upon it. I never have taken, and I do not now by any means entirely take, the view that India has been unfairly treated by this country. It is very natural indeed, and very proper, that Viceroys who go out to India should espouse the cause of India in matters in dispute between them and the Imperial Government, but I confess I do not think that their arguments have always been sound, and such as could be really acted upon. I am sorry to see that the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for War is not here to-night, because I wished to refer to that despatch which my noble friend who introduced the subject read to your Lordships. The whole gist of the important paragraph—the last one quoted in this Blue-book—is—

> "That millions of money have been spent on increasing the Army of India, on armaments and fortifications to provide for the security of India, not against domestic enemies or to prevent the incursions of the warlike people of the adjoining countries, but to maintain the supremacy of British power in the East. The scope of all these great and costly measures reaches far beyond Indian limits, and the policy which dictates them is an Imperial policy."

I do not agree with that statement. It may be Imperial policy; India is part of the Empire, and it must share in the policy of the Empire as long as it remains part of the Empire. I have never considered that there was any force in the complaint that India is obliged to provide a large military force at great expense to guard her frontier against external enemies, and that she should not have to maintain that force, because, forsooth, that is not an Indian interest. In all I say I trust I assume—I am bound to assume—that our presence in India is an advantage to the Indian people. Assuming that, I do not see that India on account of her connection with us is, as a rule, exposed to any dangers which she would not have to meet if she were entirely independent—nay, more, my opinion is that her position would be one of far less security than it is now if she had no connection with this country. There seems to be an idea on the part of those who administer the affairs of India in India that the military forces in India are only required for domestic purposes against the tribes on the frontier. Is there not a Power beyond the frontier—would that Power cease to exist and be a danger if we were to cease to hold India? Would the ambition which is generally attributed to that Power — and which I attribute to her in no sense of finding fault, because the ambition is a natural one, and it is because it is a natural one that it is a dangerous ambition to India—does anyone suppose that if this country ceased to be connected with India and India was left to protect herself she would be exposed to no dangers from the great frontier Empire which is actually almost on a boundary with her own possessions? My Lords, I am not by any means wishing to attribute any extraordinary designs to that Power, but I say that no one who found himself then in the position of having to administer Indian affairs with such strength as India itself would possess would for a moment neglect that danger beyond her frontier. Therefore I do not admit to the full extent, at all events, the argument used in that despatch. I think that in the past there has been some reason to complain, because it was formerly a policy which I agree with the noble Marquess opposite, the Prime Minister, is a policy which may now be considered to be, if I may use the expression, played out. It was formerly a principle of our policy that India was so deeply interested in the maintenance of the Ottoman Empire that in any case where that Empire was endangered you might fairly consider that it was a great Indian interest. Well, possibly in the past it may have been so; but if anyone looks at the condition of the world now, they will see—at least this is my opinion—that it is not very likely that in the future India will be called upon to aid this Empire in any great enterprise for the purpose of maintaining the Ottoman in Europe. With regard to the other matters, I think the Commission dealt very fairly with them. It attempted to lay down, and I think laid down not without success, a catalogue of those parts of the world in which India is specially interested, and of those other parts which, though to a certain extent in the neighbourhood of India, may not be considered of special interest to it. I do not think that you could make by an Act of Parliament

such a catalogue binding upon both Governments, because, in point of fact, the world does not remain at a standstill, and what might be perfectly and entirely right when Lord Welby's Commission reported may possibly, as changes in the East are not altogether unknown to us, be hereafter anything but right. Speaking generally, however, I think the Commission arrived at a very fair decision; but what I do not at all like (and I do not think the noble Earl who has just spoken held out any hope that such a course would be adopted) is the suggestion of the appointment of a permanent arbitration Commission, presided over probably by a judge of great repute, which should determine disputes between the Indian Government and the Government of this country. That, in my opinion, would simply come to this: that because we find some difficulties in doing our duty between India and this country and accommodating our disputes, therefore we are to have recourse to a system of delegating the government to some eminent judges. Now, I have a very great respect indeed for judges when they are performing duties pertaining to them, but, in my opinion, in matters political, as a rule judges are no more the best people to determine great political questions, depending on the relation between great communities, than I should be to decide a Chancery suit. That, I think, is not the least reflection on the judges; but in order to come to a fair determination on questions affecting great political issues it is essentially necessary to have had some political training. I agree also with the noble Earl that that does not by any means exclude having recourse to a system of arbitration in particular cases, and those cases may not be unfrequent. I am very glad to think that a very tiresome question, not of very great importance, but one which was hung up a great deal too long, with regard to naval expenditure, was determined by the late Prime Minister, Lord Rosebery. I am also extremely glad that so competent a man as Lord Morley was able to decide another question to which the noble Earl referred, and I do not think that these two noble Lords were at all less competent to act in those matters than the eminent judge who might preside over a tribunal, which, as it seems to me, would be something only just below the Crown itself. It would stand apparently above the Government, possibly above Parliament, indeed it would have a kind of supremacy which I look upon with considerable misgivings. It is no doubt a very simple contrivance, but I do not believe that that simple contrivance will solve the difficulties. I repeat that there are a great many questions which, instead of being left for a long time matters of warm dispute between the India Office and the Imperial Government, might be very well submitted to the arbitration of one or two sensible men who could be trusted to come to a sound decision. But whilst I have the greatest possible regard for India and also for the great Government which so ably conducts the affairs of India, yet I hold that in the ultimate resort the Parliament of this country, led by the Cabinet of this country, must be supreme. It is upon that that must ultimately rest the decision of all matters, and in my opinion any attempt to pass by the Government of the country, and to pass by the Parliament of the country, must inevitably fail To guard against too constant interference in Indian affairs you have provided for the Secretary of State for India a very valuable body—the Indian Council; and it has hitherto been the practice, I am happy to say, to avoid as far as possible making Indian affairs a matter of sharp political controversy in the House of Commons. I hope that that will long continue, though there must be exceptions, of course, when great questions are at issue from time to time. I should like to refer to one matter which no doubt is always one of the main matters of dispute—the amount to be paid by India for the services of Her Majesty's Army in India. Here I think also that there is some misconception. We are constantly told, and it is considered to be a most powerful argument, that India is a reserve for the Empire; but what is the fact? Is it the fact that India is a reserve for the Empire? I happened at one time to hold the office of Secretary of State for India when it seemed likely that we might be engaged in a great war beyond our frontiers. The first step we had to take was to mobilise a portion of our Reserves in this country, and we were well aware that every single man in our Reserves would have had to be sent out if that great war had eventuated. Of course the

existence of that Reserve was of the very utmost importance, because by it alone should we be enabled to place a sufficient force in India when occasion arose. If the Indian Government had to maintain an additional number of troops equal to that Reserve, it would entail a very large expenditure. Indeed I may say that so far as our military force suffices for the objects in view, the whole of our Army at home—the efficient portion of it—is practically a reserve for India in the case of danger; and it is quite reasonable, it seems to me, that we should regard India also as a reserve on occasions where our interests are threatened in the far East, or it may be, for instance, in Egypt. But when you come to the question whether India shall pay for such expeditions, then I must say I should always be inclined to take what is termed a liberal view of the position of India. There are cases, I think, where India ought to bear a portion of the expenses, but I think we ought always in considering these questions to deal with India in a very liberal and generous spirit. It is a great thing for us to be able to lay our hands on those troops, and to use them when occasion requires, and I do not think we ought to be too stiff with regard to the financial question as to who is to pay for their services when they are taken out of the country. My Lords, there are a number of smaller questions upon which I will only say that I think the recommendations of the Commission are well worthy of attention. I should not like to pledge myself (although it does not very much signify what my opinion may be) to each and every one of those suggestions. They seem very valuable suggestions, and I have no doubt they will receive very careful consideration by the India Office and by Her Majesty's Government. I have very little more to add in the matter. I think that it is highly expedient that there should be no prolonged and acrimonious disputes between the Departments with regard to Indian affairs, and I am quite certain that no one will yield to myself in the strong desire always to support the authority of the Government of India, the authority of the Viceroy, and to deal with our fellow-subjects of the Indian Empire not only in a wise, but in a generous spirit, which I believe to be at the same time the sound and good policy of this country.

The Earl of Kimberley.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (The Marquess of SALISBURY): My Lords, I do not know that I have any special reason for interposing in this debate, because, on the whole, I concur very much with the sentiments that were addressed to you by the noble Earl who has just sat down. I am glad that the India Office, under the guidance of the Commission, has been able to make pecuniary arrangements which will be satisfactory to those who have charge of the administration of India. But I entirely concur with the noble Earl opposite in repudiating the idea that India has any reason to complain of the treatment which she has received at our hands. I am very glad that this should be a generous and liberal treatment. It is very desirable not only on account of our political position, but also because the mass of the people of India are a much more struggling and suffering race than the mass of the people of this country. But I think that, with whatever qualifications in favour of liberality and generosity, we ought to look upon it as an adjustment and balancing of burdens between the taxpayers of the two countries. People talk as if this expense was Imperial, and, therefore, expense that we ought to undertake without considering whether it falls more upon us than it does upon the Indian Exchequer. That seems to me an unsound doctrine. We ought to bear the common burdens of the Empire as far as possible according to an equal and equitable rule, always remembering that we are dealing with a weaker community whose sufferings at times—and we have had recently terrible examples of it—are singularly severe; but it is a question of the British taxpayer against the Indian taxpayer, and you must observe justice between the two. There is also another—as it seems to me—fallacy in arguing this Indian question, which has been pushed too much forward, and that is that we are bound to bear a certain number of expenses on behalf of India, because, as a matter of fact, we have borne them on behalf of many of our colonies. I cannot see the cogency of that argument at all. "Is thine eye evil because I am good?" We have, partly from policy, partly from reaction on the great American conflict, and from other reasons, been exceedingly generous in our dealings with the colonies during the

last fifty years, but I do not think that by that we incurred an obligation to apply precisely the same rule to every other case that came up for judgment, or that we are bound to discharge this or that claim on the part of India because we have discharged another on the part of our colonies. I would not admit that argument at all. We have to deal with the colonies on the equitable ground; and, remembering always the obligation of liberality and generosity, there is no special call for expenditure which comes upon us because we occupy an Imperial position. It is quite true that it depends on this country to make the expenditure which will defend both India and the colonies, but India does not incur the claim of allegiance as a matter of favour and consideration to us. The less there is of that *quasi*-sentimental language, and the more we adhere as far as circumstances permit us to do so to the strict rule of justice, the less discontent there will arise. My Lords, we have not gone very far yet into this Report, and at present really the financial burden is one that presses most upon us; but if you consider for a moment you will see how complicated and difficult the relations of India and this country in financial matters are. There is that fortress of Aden; we are told now that we are to take either the whole or the great part of the expenditure on the fortress of Aden. But, if India did not exist, of what possible use would the fortress of Aden be to the British Empire? And I must say that I think much of the expenditure which is thrown upon this country in regard to Persia is subject to the same objection—that it is for India, and for India only, that a certain class of those expenditures in Oriental countries are incurred, and therefore India ought to bear her fair share. What is now happening in the East brings home to us very much how heavy the burden of defending our position in the East may come to be, and we may have in the future to ask whether others besides this little island at this end of the world are not concerned in the maintenance of that great fabric of Chinese trade which has nourished so many parts of the Empire. I will not press into ground which is not open to us yet, but I will only urge upon those who have to deal with this question that we are not dealing with a bottomless purse when we are disposing of the resources of the British Empire. We are bound not to put on others any obligation which they cannot bear; but we may find that, without injustice to others, we cannot accept the exclusive burden which we take as part of our claim to Empire, which belongs to our British ascendency, but which, after all, is borne not for any special advantage of our own, but because it is part of that great fabric of beneficence and of peace which it has fallen to us by the action of history to bear as the British Empire. My Lords, I only rose to say these few words, because I think there is a tendency — certainly not in the language of the noble Earl, but I think there is a tendency—to lean too much to the sentimental side and too little to what I might call the business side. "Short accounts make long friendships," and the more perfect justice we endeavour to observe, the more we shall avoid that greatest of all calamities—any difference of opinion with our great Indian Empire.

On Question, agreed to. Return ordered accordingly.

EXECUTORS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for Second Reading read.

*LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH: My Lords, this is a Bill of a legal, and therefore I think I may say of an almost entirely technical character. Its object is to remedy certain inconveniences which have been found to exist in the administration of executory estates in Scotland—to meet inconveniences arising from the fact of executors not possessing certain powers which have been conferred by statute upon trustees. The object of the Bill is to confer upon executors who derive their title directly or indirectly from a testator powers which have been conferred on gratuitous trustees by various Acts from 1861 to 1898. The Bill was drawn some years ago by a competent practitioner, and has been revised both by him and by a committee of practising lawyers. It has been generally approved by the Department over which I have the honour to preside, but up to this session it had not been found possible to give time in the other House of Parliament for its consideration. It

has now passed through the other House of Parliament with the general consent of the Scottish lawyers who have seats in that assembly. It has been favourably reported upon by various legal societies in Scotland—namely, by the Society of Writers to the Signet, whose amendments have been incorporated in parts of the Bill, and also very favourably indeed by the Faculty of Procurators in Glasgow. It has the approval of the Treasury on the ground that it will facilitate administrative convenience. The only particulars in which this Bill is different in structure from the Bills which have been before Parliament in former years are contained in the second clause of the Bill. The Faculty of Procurators approve of the Bill as it now stands. I think that some members of the Faculty of Advocates are not so well satisfied with the change, but I have the assurance of the present Lord Justice General that he has come to approve of the Bill in its present form, and I hope that without material change it may pass your Lordships' House. I beg to move that it be now read a second time.

Bill read 2ª (according to Order), and committed to a Committee of the whole House on Tuesday next.

DIOCESAN REGISTRATION BILL (H.L.)

Read 3ª (according to Order), and passed, and sent to the Commons.

MERCHANT SHIPPING (LIABILITY OF SHIPOWNERS AND OTHERS) BILL.

Order of the Day for the Third Reading read.

Moved, That the Bill be now read 3ª.—(*Lord Heneage.*)

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (The Earl of HALSBURY) said he was surprised that the noble Lord had moved the Third Reading, as he had received from the noble Lord the assurance—as he understood it—that the Third Reading would not be taken until Monday. He hoped, not only for the sake of this particular matter, but in the interests of the conduct of business in this House, that the motion would not be persisted in in face of the understanding to which he had alluded.

Lord Balfour of Burleigh.

LORD HENEAGE said that as his credit, too, was at stake, he must explain that the only question raised between the noble and learned Lord and himself was whether it would be more convenient that the noble and learned Lord should move his Amendment on the Report stage yesterday or on the Third Reading to-day. The noble and learned Lord pointed out that as the Tithes Bill was down for Second Reading on Thursday it would be more convenient to take the Report stage of this Bill formally on Thursday, and that the noble and learned Lord should move his Amendment to-day. That was all that took place. If this were only a matter of convenience between the noble and learned Lord and himself he would not object to postponing the Third Reading; but there were several noble Lords present who had come down specially for this Bill, and he therefore could not take upon himself to withdraw the Bill from the purview of the House. He regretted that this misunderstanding had arisen, but in the circumstances he felt bound to press his motion for the Third Reading of the Bill.

THE EARL OF HALSBURY moved "That the debate on the said motion be adjourned."

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY suggested that as there had clearly been a personal misunderstanding, and there was no question of the delay involving the loss of the Bill, this was not a matter upon which their Lordships should be put to the trouble of dividing, and he hoped Lord Heneage would consent to the adjournment.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY joined with Lord Kimberley in suggesting that Lord Heneage should, as a matter of grace, give way.

LORD HENEAGE said that after this expression of opinion from the Leaders on both sides of the House, he felt himself at liberty to consent to the adjournment.

On Question, "That the debate on the said motion be adjourned," resolved in the affirmative, and ordered accordingly; Bill to be read 3ª on Monday next.

MEMBERS OF LOCAL AUTHORITIES RELIEF BILL [H.L.].

Read 3ª (according to Order), and passed, and sent to the Commons.

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES ACT (1890) AMENDMENT BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

*LORD HARRIS: My Lords, as your Lordships see, this Bill amends the Housing of the Working Classes Act of 1890, and if I do not detain your Lordships at very great length upon it, I trust it will not be attributed to any want of interest in a subject of such immense and vital importance to hundreds of thousands of people living under very uncomfortable, and, I fear, very insanitary conditions in our great towns, and possibly in some cases in villages. I do not think it is necessary for me to detain you at any very great length, because I do not think there is really any serious opposition, or any opposition at all to the Bill. There may be differences of opinion as to whether the Bill might not have taken a larger scope, but so far as the Bill does go, I do not understand that there is any opposition to it. The Act of 1890 deals with three different subjects. It is divided into three parts. The first part, which refers to London chiefly, deals with unhealthy areas, provides for their clearance, and for the erection of buildings for the housing of persons who have been dishoused by the clearance of the area. The second part deals with the unhealthy dwelling houses and their destruction, and also with houses which are obstructive, which interfere with the sanitary conditions of their own neighbourhood. The third part deals with working class lodging-houses. It is with this third part, which is adoptive by the bodies which have the power of adopting it, that the Bill now before your Lordships deals. Under the third part the local authority has the power of acquiring land and erecting lodging-houses for poor people within its area, and it is in this that a difficulty has presented itself. Your Lordships know just as well or even better than I do how extremely difficult it is for a local authority in London or any large town to obtain a site within its boundaries for the erection of lodging-houses. The expense of the land is very serious, and I believe that one of the reasons that have caused this Bill to be brought forward now is that the County Council of London found themselves unable to accept an offer of a site outside their own boundary. The Bill before your Lordships will enable a local authority to go outide its own area, acquire land, and put up lodging-houses on it for the purpose of the inhabitants of the area which it governs. That is what is dealt with under the first clause of the Bill, and I think I am justified in saying that it is the most important in the Bill. That applies to any council other than a rural district council which has adopted Part III. of the Act of 1890. Clause 2 deals with the rural district council, and the difficulty that has been met with there is not of the same character. The difficulty there is in the matter of procedure. Under the present law a rural district council has to obtain the approval of the county council by a laborious process. The county council has to appoint a committee, and has to inquire very closely in detail upon the spot, and altogether it has been found that that process is so laborious that the district councils have been discouraged from adopting that part of the Act. Clause 2 of the Bill before your Lordships simplifies that procedure. The consent of the county council is still necessary, but it will not be necessary for that county council to go through the same process that it had to take under the present Act. Sub-section 2 provides—

"(2) In giving or withholding their consent under this section, the county council shall have regard—

(*a*) To the area for which it is proposed to adopt the said Part; and

(*b*) To the necessity for accommodation for the housing of the working classes in that area; and

(*c*) To the probability of such accommodation being provided without the adoption of the said Part; and

(*d*) To the liability which will be incurred by the rates, and to the question whether it is, under all the circumstances, prudent for the district council to adopt the said Part."

The 3rd Clause of the Bill will enable the new Metropolitan Borough Councils to adopt Part III. as amended, and to exercise powers under the Act as amended for the acquirement of land and the putting up of houses for the purpose. Then, my Lords, at present the law insists upon expenditure upon one part of

the Bill being accounted for under that part. Clause 4 of this Bill will enable the local authority to account for expenditure under Part III. under any one of the other parts. For instance, if an area has been cleared under Part I., and if a site for lodging-houses has been acquired under Part III., and a profit can be made by the scheme under Part III., that profit may be set against the expenditure under Part I. The only condition is that there shall be a separate account. Then, under Clause 5—

"(1) The local authority, if not a rural district council, with the consent of the Local Government Board, and if a rural district council with the consent of the county council, may lease any land acquired by them under and for the purposes of Part III. of the Housing of the Working Classes Act, 1890 (in this section referred to as 'the Act,') to any lessee for the purpose and under the condition that the lessee will carry the Act into execution by building and maintaining on the land lodging-houses within the meaning of the Act."

That was an Amendment put in during the course of the Bill through the House of Commons with a very practical argument behind it that it might very possibly be that some person perfectly competent and anxious to do work of this kind might be very much better able to do it than the county council itself, and therefore this provision has been made, that the local authority, with the consent of certain higher authority, may for the purpose of carrying out the intention lease the land. Sections 61 and 62 of the Act will not extend to any lodging-house to which this Act applies. For this reason: that those sections refer to the local authority where the land has been acquired—that is to say, the land outside the area administered by the local authority which has acquired it. Let us take the case of the London County Council. If they had acquired some land outside their own area they naturally would not want the local authority in that area to manage their lodging-houses for them. The intention is to retain the management of those lodging-houses in the hands of the authority that has acquired the area. Under Clause 6, on the complaint of a parish council where a district council has, in the opinion of the parish council, failed to adopt the Act when it ought to have adopted it, or failed to carry out a scheme which might in the opinion of the parish council have been advantageously carried out, the county council is empowered to examine into the arguments pro and con., and, if it thinks right, to take over the powers of the rural district council, and to adopt the Act with regard to that particular scheme. Under Clause 7 a cheaper form of arbitration is provided for, whereby a single arbitrator will be called in instead of, as has been the practice, two arbitrators with an umpire in case of disagreement. These, my Lords, are the general provisions of the Bill. The main objections that have been taken to it are as follows: It has been objected that the Bill does not contain provisions for securing convenient railway and tramway facilities. It was thought by some Members of the House of Commons who I am sure have a very wide knowledge of the conditions under which people live in these very crowded areas, that this Bill should have taken a wider scope and should have provided for, I think I may say, the compulsion of railway companies to run convenient workmen's trains to these areas before the lodging-houses were built. Well, in the opinion of the Government, the powers of the President of the Board of Trade are already sufficient to secure that convenient workmen's trains shall be run to these areas when there is some indication that there will be a population there requiring those trains. That is so far as trains are concerned. With regard to tramways I understand the difficulty to be this: that a local authority wishing to project a tramway not only through its own area, but through the area of, we will say, a neighbouring local authority, is unable to obtain the ear of Parliament because the local authority which intervenes or is outside the particular area, if it objects, can prevent the first local authority approaching Parliament at all. A deputation waited upon Mr. Chaplin, the President of the Local Government Board, and Mr. Ritchie, the President of the Board of Trade, with the object of placing before them their views upon this particular point. Having considered very attentively the representations put forward by that deputation, I believe the intention of the Government—I do not know that I am authorised to say that they intend to do it, but I am sure that I am authorised in saying that they are considering most sympathetically the proposal to omit the present Standing Order No. 22, with a view to insert a new Standing Order providing that where a local

authority desires to run a tramway through the area of another local authority, the first local authority shall be entitled to be heard by Parliament. I understand the difficulty at present is that they are debarred from being heard before Parliament in such a case if an objection is raised by a neighbouring local authority. If the Standing Orders are amended as suggested then the local authority desiring to project the tramway will, at any rate, be heard by Parliament, and I am given to understand that the members of the Government who have given their consideration to this are prepared to support it. I do not know whether it has at present come before the Chairman of Committees in this House, but I believe it has come before the similar authority in the other House, and has been approved there. Those are two of the objections that have been raised to the Bill. Another objection is that the Bill ought to have provided for the power of a local authority to hire land outside its own area. That the Government have opposed—I personally think upon thoroughly sound grounds. I can imagine most serious injustice being done to very deserving people and people who are by no means in very affluent circumstances. If such a power did exist one can conceive this—I do not say injustice, because it would be the law, but I think it would be rather unfair—that a man having invested his fortune in a piece of land would be under the risk of its being acquired by a local authority and his not receiving even the purchase price of the land, but only such an amount of rent (in perpetuity, I believe, is the intention) as somebody or other—not the local authority, I presume, but some arbitrator—might decide was at that date the value of the land. How the individual would ever re-acquire the real estate I am not sure. However, there was a proposal in some such form as that which the Government opposed in the other House, and it was not pressed. My Lords, the general complaint in the other House was that the Bill was not of a large enough scope, that it might have been a very much more heroic measure altogether. Well, there is a different opinion, which is that in this matter—an extremely difficulty one, affecting the rights of property—it is on the whole better to go slow than to take a very long time poring and arguing over the merits or demerits of a large measure, and perhaps in the end not producing out of the argument anything very valuable. At any rate, if this is not a very long step in advance, I honestly believe that it will be a useful one. It endeavours to remedy at any rate one serious difficulty, the difficulty which the local authority has in obtaining land at a moderate price. There is one other objection, I remember, which was raised, and that is that the Bill did not contain any provision for the length of time within which a loan obtained by a local authority for acquiring land should be repaid. The suggestion was that the term of sixty years should be extended to seventy, or even up to 100 years. That was resisted by the Government in the other House on the ground that it is impossible to say now what may be the demand for houses sixty years hence or longer, and that sixty years is a sufficient period during which it is safe to allow these loans to be repaid. My Lords, as I say, the Bill does not profess to be a great scheme. It follows on the lines of those Bills that have been at various times introduced, and which were consolidated in the Bill of my noble friend the noble Viscount behind me (Viscount Cross) in 1890. It endeavours to meet a distinct difficulty which has been experienced by the County Council of London amongst others, and I think your Lordships will see for yourselves that if the Bill, when it becomes law, is as effective as the Government believes it can be made to be, it does solve one of the most difficult problems which we have to face in the case of these overcrowded areas—that the local authority can take the people concerned out of a crowded area into one in which the sanitary conditions are far better. Those are the main reasons with which the Bill has been introduced. It has, on the whole, I think, been received by thoughtful people even on the other side of the House in the House of Commons with approval, although I admit that there have been these criticisms; but as a whole it has been received with approval, having regard to the divisions and the speeches. I have read every speech that has been made in the other House, and I think I am perfectly justified in saying that the Bill has been received with approval there where it has been debated at consider-

able length, and I hope it may receive the same approval from your Lordships.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Lord Harris.*)

EARL CARRINGTON: My Lords, the great interest that has been taken in this Bill and in the question of the housing of the working classes generally must be my excuse for troubling your Lordships with a few words upon this motion, first as a member of the Housing Committee of the London County Council, and also as an elected Member for St. Pancras, which is one of the most congested parts of the whole of congested London. I have listened with great attention to the very lucid speech of the noble Lord who moved the Second Reading. With two points brought forward by him I entirely agree. He says this is not a great scheme. Indeed it is not. He also says that there will be no opposition. Naturally there will be no opposition from this side of the House, or, at any rate, there there will be no opposition from the Liberal party, but I am bound to say that the scheme has been received by the whole Liberal party with very great and grievous disappointment. The noble Lord did not say much about the circumstances that led up to this Bill being brought forward. I will for one moment refer to them, and if I say anything that is not the fact there is Lord Cross, who has the whole thing at his fingers' ends, and he will correct me if I fall into any error. From 1851, when Lord Shaftesbury's two Acts were passed, up to 1870, there was no desire on the part of municipalities to take action in this matter of the housing of the poor. Then the noble Viscount opposite brought in his Acts of 1876, 1879 and 1882, and those, with Mr. Torrens' Acts of 1866 and 1868, produced a little improvement; but I think I am only speaking the absolute truth when I say that mainly owing to the expensive machinery required to put those various Acts into motion the activity that was shown was short lived and spasmodic. Then in 1884 the noble Marquess (Lord Salisbury) moved for the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into the whole subject. We sat for two years and issued a unanimous Report. I cannot say that there was anything very—to use the noble Lord's language—heroic in that Report, but it had the effect of leading to the Bill of 1885, which was put forward by the noble Marquess, and on the Report of this Commission I think I may fairly say that the consolidation and amendment of the foregoing Acts with Lord Salisbury's Act of 1885 were effected by the Housing of the Working Classes Act of 1890, which simplified and cheapened the machinery involved in municipal action. In 1889 the Conservative Government created the London County Council, and the Metropolitan Board of Works ceased to exist. The Metropolitan Board of Works, as the House well knows, used to clear away insanitary areas and sell land to building companies, and I believe during the whole of its existence it housed a little more than 27,000 persons up to the year 1889, when it ceased to exist. The London County Council then came into operation, and they began to build themselves in 1892, and in eight years we have housed 10,000 persons. What we have in hand now and what we have completed in the last sixteen months amounts to an additional accommodation for 25,000 more people, at a cost of £1,500,000, and we confidently expect that schemes that we are considering will enable us to house an additional 24,500 persons, making a grand total of 60,000 persons rehoused within the next five years. But, after all, we have been told that this is only touching the fringe of the question. That I admit, but I say that we could have done a great deal better, and we could have really—if I may be permitted to use the expression in this House—tackled the question in sober earnest, had we had greater facilities for housing the working classes. The noble Lord opposite said there were very few objections that had been made to this Bill in the House of Commons, and he mentioned some of them, but I venture to think that he forgot some of the most important ones. There are five propositions of what is really wanted for housing the poor in urban districts. First of all, the period within which loans for building purposes must be repaid, should be considerably extended. As the noble Lord said, it is now up to sixty years, and we ask as a matter of justice that it should be extended to 100 years. If noble Lords would be kind enough to go round to the Millbank site, and see the building being put up there by the London County Council for the housing of the working classes, they will,

I am perfectly certain, agree that it is absolutely preposterous to imagine that those buildings will not last 100 years. Then the next thing we want is the compulsory registration of the real owners of all property, so that those benefiting from insanitary slums and illegal overcrowdings could be immediately and drastically dealt with. Your Lordships know that the Land Transfer Act of 1897 is not compulsory, except in a few parts of London. The third thing we require is power to the local authority to have destroyed without compensation, and at the cost of the owner, insanitary slums which are injurious to health, where the owners fail to make them really habitable after being called upon to do so, and if then the owner refuses to rebuild, the local body should have the power to do so on equitable terms. Fourthly, we want power given to the local authorities—this point was mentioned by the noble Lord—to insist on a much better transit service to and from the suburbs of the great towns. At present the cheap transit follows the peopling of a new district. If overcrowding is to be really prevented, cheap transit must be used largely in the development of new districts, and must not be left merely to follow their development. Then, fifthly, what we have always asked for, and what this Bill no doubt gives, is that local governing bodies in our great towns should be empowered to acquire land compulsorily outside their own jurisdiction for the erection of workmen's dwellings. The Bill on the Table gives us this last concession, but it refuses to entertain the other points which we consider so essential to the welfare of the community at large. I have spoken of the disappointment with which this Bill is received by the party to which I have the honour to belong, and I maintain that we have cause to complain that so little has been done for the working classes only at the end of five years by this all-powerful Government to try to put an end to a condition of things which is a danger to the State and a disgrace and a stain to our civilisation and our Christianity.

THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (The Earl of MORLEY): I only wanted to call attention to one or two points mentioned by the noble Lord behind me, but I cannot help being rather amused at hearing my noble friend opposite, as a representative of the Liberal party, talking of their disappointment at the character of this Bill. As far as I know, the whole legislation relating to the curing of these formidable evils, which I fully admit, was carried out by my noble friends behind me; and during the time that the noble Lord opposite and the Liberal party were in office, I am not aware that they did anything towards carrying into the Statute-book any of those reforms that my noble friend has enumerated just now. It is rather amusing, therefore, now to hear my noble friend expressing bitter disappointment at the small nature of this Bill. However, my Lords, that is neither here nor there—it is by the way. I did want to say one word about a matter that was referred to by my noble friend in moving the Second Reading of the Bill—namely, the question of the consent of local authorities to tramways running through their district from another district. As the House is aware, at present under the Standing Orders of the House the consent of any local authority, or, if the local authority differs from the road authority, the road authority as well, is necessary as a preliminary to the introduction of any Bill. It is what is called an Examiner's Standing Order, and unless the consent of the authority is proved before the Examiner it is impossible for the Bill to come before Parliament at all. Now, I entirely sympathise with the views of my noble friend who has moved the Second Reading of the Bill, and I think they to a great extent fall in with the views of my noble friend opposite. I am strongly of opinion that the local authorities ought to have a very strong voice when tramways are put through their district by persons, either companies or municipalities, outside those districts; but, beyond giving them a mandatory power of being heard before Committees, I venture to think it would be desirable (and I should be very glad, if certain circumstances arise, to move an Amendment in the Standing Orders to that effect) to take away from authorities the absolute power of stopping schemes of this kind. That is the main point to which I wanted to call attention; but I confess that I am very glad to hear from my noble friend that the Government do not look with any favour upon the idea of compulsory hiring

in matters of this kind. I think this question of compulsory hiring, which has cropped up in several directions, at present is not a very safe one. If local authorities or companies for public purposes require land, surely they ought to take the land with all its liabilities and obligations upon it, and allow the owner to be absolutely free. I think this question of compulsory hiring is a most dangerous one, and that it will act very unfairly and with great hardship upon owners of land. There is a very important question raised by the noble Lord opposite as to the length of term during which loans for various objects should be repaid by local authorities. I do not like to dogmatise at all on such a question. I quite see the importance that it is to local authorities to get those terms prolonged, but still it ought to be done with very great caution. At present the maximum term is sixty years—that is, two generations; and I think we ought to have very strong arguments before we extend the term very much beyond that. One hardly knows what changes may take place in the surroundings of any undertaking or any scheme in the course of two generations. As I said, I am not prepared to dogmatise on the subject, but I confess that at present very strong arguments should be brought forward to induce Parliament to assent to extending the time beyond the sixty years or two generations that has thus far prevailed.

VISCOUNT CROSS: I should not have intervened in this debate if it had not been for the reference made to myself personally by the noble Lord opposite. He has given a fairly accurate account of the history of this particular kind of legislation, and it is a great satisfaction to me to find that public opinion has grown very much upon this subject, especially of late years. It was in the year 1875 when I had the honour of bringing forward a Bill to enable the authorities in London to get rid of what you may call the unhealthy areas; and if anybody remembers what unhealthy areas there were in London at that time, and were to go to those places and see the fine buildings erected now for the lodging of the labouring classes in their place, he would be perfectly amazed at the change that has taken place. I do not believe that there is one of these unhealthy areas now existing in London which it was the special object of the Bill of 1875 to remove. But so difficult was it at that time to pass a Bill of that kind that I remember very well when I laid the instructions before the noble Lord, Lord Thring, who was then the Parliamentary draughtsman, to draw that Bill he came to me and positively refused to carry out my instructions. I inquired why. He said, "I can only characterise your Bill, Mr. Cross, in two words — Communism and Confiscation." Well, I do not think there is much confiscation if you look at the amount of money which the City of London and the Metropolitan Board of Works had to pay in order to carry out the Act; while as to Communism, if by communism is meant doing what you can to house the working classes in fit and decent places, not at the expense of the State, but to enable them to house themselves in decent houses, then I am quite willing to be called a Communist. But it was not till I drew the Preamble of that Act of 1875 that the noble Lord would consent to draw the clauses which were to give effect to it. Public opinion has changed very considerably since then. That Act of 1875 is now embodied in the Act of 1890. The noble Lord opposite has complained that the present Bill does not go quite far enough. At all events, it does make a very substantial step in the right direction. It will enable local authorities, where it is almost impossible for them to obtain land within their area, to obtain equally good land for the housing of the working classes outside the area. If it did no more than that it would have done a great deal. It will, I believe, promote the building of houses for the working classes, and I sincerely hope your Lordships will not only give the Bill a Second Reading but will carry it through as it is. I am bound to say I quite agree with what has fallen from the noble Lord the Chairman of Committees. I do not think that the time of borrowing ought to be extended too much. Sixty years, as the noble Earl has said, covers two generations. At all events, if the present generation is not to bear its own burdens, do not go beyond the next generation. If you come to 100 years you come to the third and fourth generations, who will have burdens of their own to bear independently of those which you want to place upon them. Therefore I for one

should be certainly opposed to an enlargement of the time during which the money is to be repaid. My Lords, I believe this Bill is a substantial contribution to what we all want to see, and I heartily support the Second Reading.

LORD WINDSOR: I wanted to ask one question upon the Bill and its relation to the Housing of the Working Classes Act, 1890. In the first place we are all agreed that this is not a very large scheme; but I think that the noble Lord who moved the Second Reading of this Bill is justified in saying that it is a step in the right direction, and on two grounds particularly I should be inclined to support it. One is that I think the ratepayers have a right to some relief. We all know the difficulty in rehousing the working classes in the very centre of the huge population of London. Only a few hours ago in a Committee Room upstairs a member of the London County Council was giving evidence, and he stated that a site had been acquired at the cost of £200,000, and that with the condition upon it of erecting workmen's dwelling-houses it was valued at £45,000; that is, that the commercial value of the land had been reduced 75 per cent. at least in consideration of the condition attached as to the erection of workmen's dwelling-houses upon it. In fact, he gave us instances more striking even that that. Another one that I may mention was an instance of a site that had been acquired and had been put up to auction, and not one single bid of one single penny-piece did they get from anyone for this land, because of the condition attached to it. Therefore, I say that I do think it is desirable for the sake of the ratepayers that larger powers should be given to acquire land outside the area, so that the London County Council, for instance, can make greater use of the powers which I believe they already have; that is of, in certain cases, selling land when they have taken away the old houses—selling the land at its commercial value, and buying other more suitable land for the erection of dwelling-houses. My Lords, it is not possible, it is not to be expected, that exactly the same persons who are displaced can be immediately housed in new dwellings. We had an instance of that mentioned in evidence this afternoon before the Committee to which I have referred. A witness for the London County Council told us that on a certain site where tenants had been displaced new buildings were erected, and a certain number of the old tenants applied for these new buildings, but their behaviour has been such that it has been absolutely impossible to keep them; no respectable person would take lodgings under the same roof with them, because they were not amenable to any proper discipline, and such discipline as is absolutely necessary for persons living together in the same building. So that we do not suppose that these persons will be immediately housed, but it certainly will have a tendency to remove the congestion if these dwellings are built on outside areas. The persons who occupy them must at any rate have lived somewhere before—they will have left their own houses and left them empty, or if the houses had been overcrowded before it will have a tendency to remove the congestion. Therefore, I think the noble Lord is perfectly justified in saying that it is a step in the right direction. My Lords, I wanted to ask what relation has this Bill, under Part III. of the Housing of the Working Classes Act, 1890, which is mentioned over and over again, with Part I. of that same Act. In Clause 12, Sub-section 3, Part I. of the Housing of the Working Classes Act, 1890, I read that—

> "The local authority may also engage with any body of trustees, society, or person, to carry the whole or any part of such scheme into effect upon such terms as the local authority may think expedient, but the local authority shall not themselves, without the express approval of the confirming authority, undertake the rebuilding of the houses."

Then in Sub-section 5—

> "If the local authority erect any dwellings out of funds to be provided under this part of the Act, they shall, unless the confirming authority otherwise determine, sell and dispose of all such dwellings within ten years from the time of the completion thereof."

Then, turning to Part III., Clause 59—

> "The local authority may, on any land acquired or appropriated by them, erect any buildings suitable for lodging-houses."

And further on, Clause 61 says—

> "The general management, regulation, and control of the lodging-houses established or acquired by a local authority under this part of this Act shall be vested in and exercised by the local authority."

LORD HARRIS: That is cut out in this Bill.

LORD WINDSOR: Then I presume it would mean that they are not to rebuild houses other than lodging-houses.

LORD HARRIS: My noble friend opposite, Lord Carrington, knows better than I do, but I think the explanation is that the houses referred to in Part I. are not lodging-houses. It is only Part III. that deals with lodging-houses, and if a local authority builds houses on the area that has been cleared they need not be necessarily lodging-houses; they may be probably houses of any kind or description.

EARL CARRINGTON: Under, I think, the 13th Clause of Lord Salisbury's Act the noble Lord will find in the definition that "lodging-house" means any house or tenement of any sort or description that is erected for the occupation of the poor. "Lodging-house" does not mean a house kept for lodgers to live in, but it includes every sort of house, whether two families live in it or one, that is erected for the occupation of the poor. I think that is the definition of "lodging-house" in the Act of 1890.

On Question, agreed to.

Bill read 2ª accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the whole House on Monday next.

PROHIBITION OF EXPORTATION OF ARMS BILL [H.L.].

A Bill to amend the law relating to the exportation of arms, ammunition, and military and naval stores—was presented by The Lord Chancellor; read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª on Monday next. (No. 205.)

House adjourned at half-past Seven of the clock, to Monday next, a quarter before Eleven of the clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 20th July, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [Lords] (NO STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, no Standing Orders are applicable, viz.:—

Fraser Settled Chattels Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.

BELFAST AND COUNTY DOWN RAILWAY BILL.

Lords Amendment considered, and agreed to.

JARROW AND HEBBURN ELECTRICITY SUPPLY BILL.

NOTTINGHAM CORPORATION BILL.

Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

EDINBURGH CORPORATION BILL [Lords].

Queen's consent signified; read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

GREAT GRIMSBY STREET TRAMWAYS BILL [Lords].

Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

HAMMOND (G. H.) COMPANY BILL [Lords].

LONDON AND SAN FRANCISCO BANK BILL [Lords].

Read the third time, and passed, without amendment.

MARGATE PIER AND HARBOUR BILL [Lords].

Queen's consent signified; read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

MERSEY RAILWAY BILL [Lords].

RAWMARSH URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL (TRAMWAYS) BILL [Lords].

Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

LIVERPOOL OVERHEAD RAILWAY BILL [Lords].

As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

ROTHERHAM CORPORATION BILL [Lords]. (BY ORDER.)

As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 12) BILL.

Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

EDINBURGH (HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES) IMPROVEMENT SCHEME PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

Reported, without amendment [Provisional Order confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

PAISLEY WATERWORKS PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

Reported, without amendment [Provisional Order confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

TRAMWAYS ORDERS CONFIRMATION (No. 1) BILL [Lords].

Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Bill, as amended, to be considered upon Monday next.

RAILWAYS (IRELAND) AMALGAMATION BILLS.

Minutes of Proceedings of the Joint Committee to be printed. [No. 293.]

GLASGOW DISTRICT TRAMWAYS [Lords].

Reported [Preamble not proved]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

RAILWAY BILLS (GROUP 8).

Sir LEWIS M'IVER reported from the Committee on Group 8 of Railway Bills, That, for the convenience of the Committee, they had adjourned till Tuesday next, at half-past Eleven of the clock.

Report to lie upon the Table.

DUBLIN CORPORATION BILL AND CLONTARF URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL BILL (JOINT COMMITTEE).

Dublin Corporation Bill and Clontarf Urban District Council Bill reported, with Amendments.

Leave to the Committee to make a Special Report.

Special Report brought up, and read.

Reports and Special Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill, Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill, Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 13) Bill, Local Government Provisional Order (Housing of Working Classes) Bill, London (Clerkenwell and Holborn) Provisional Order Bill, London (Poplar) Provisional Order Bill, without amendment.

That they have agreed to—South-Eastern Metropolitan Tramways Bill, with an Amendment.

That they have agreed to—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill, Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill, Great Northern Railway Bill, Midland Railway Bill, Portland Urban District Gas Bill, with Amendments.

That they have agreed to Amendment to Amendments to—Hamilton, Motherwell, and Wishaw Tramways Bill.

That they have agreed to Amendments to—South Staffordshire Tramways Bill [Lords], Aston Manor Tramways Bill [Lords], Falkirk and District Water Bill [Lords], without amendment.

That they have agreed to—Burnley Corporation Bill [Lords], with an Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill intituled, "An Act for empowering the Midland Great Western Railway of Ireland Company to acquire additional lands; to raise additional capital; and for other purposes." Midland Great Western Railway of Ireland Bill [Lords].

MIDLAND GREAT WESTERN RAILWAY OF IRELAND BILL [Lords].

Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

PETITIONS.

EAST INDIA (CONTAGIOUS DISEASES).

Petitions for alteration of law, from Hoshangabad; Ferozepore; Calcutta; Bundi; Shimoga; Neemuch; Sandoway; Ludhiana (two); Nagpur; Hsipaw; Bhaisdehi; Aijal; Jalua (two); Ahmedabad; Batala; Girgoon; Bengal; Santipor;

Bankipur; Belgaum; and Muttra; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Dundee, against; to lie upon Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (No. 2) BILL.

Two Petitions from Leicester, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Old Kilpatrick; and Loudoun; to lie upon the Table.

SUNDAY CLOSING (MONMOUTHSHIRE) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Belgrave Gate; Denby Dale; and Leicester (two); to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION.

Copy presented, of Forty-fourth Report of the Commissioners, with Appendix [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of a Light Railway in the counties of Devon and Cornwall from Bere Alston Station to Calstock, and the working of a portion of the East Cornwall Mineral Railway as a Light Railway (Bere Alston and Calstock Light Railway Order, 1900) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION COMMITTEES (WOMEN MEMBERS).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 5th April; *Mr. Jebb*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 289.]

TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION ACT, 1889.

Copy presented, of Minute sanctioning the subjects to be taught under Clause 8 of the Act for the county of Middlesex (Fifth Minute) [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

AGRARIAN OUTRAGES (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Return for the quarter ended 30th June, 1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PUBLIC RECORDS (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Thirty-second Report of the Deputy Keeper of the Public Records and Keeper of the State Papers in Ireland [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 2479 to 2483 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ARMY (SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1900-1901).

Estimate presented, of the Further Amount which will be required in the year ending 31st March, 1901, to meet the Additional Expenditure, mainly due to the War in South Africa, Affairs in China, and for increased reserves of Stores [by Command]; Referred to the Committee of Supply, and to be printed. [No. 290.]

ARMY (ORDNANCE FACTORIES) (ESTIMATE, 1900-1901).

Copy presented, of Revised Estimate of Charge for the year 1900-1901 [by Command]; Referred to the Committee of Supply, and to be printed. [No. 291.]

QUESTIONS.

CHINA—ANTI-FOREIGN OUTBREAK—INCREASE OF BRITISH FORCES.

MR. JOSEPH WALTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Barnsley): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, in view of the grave situation in China, he will give the House full details of the considerable reinforcements of men and ships which he stated were on their way to China, in addition to the increases previously announced; and whether Her Majesty's Government have decided to further augment our naval and military forces in the Far East for the protection of the lives and property of British subjects.

*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. BROD-

RICK, Surrey, Guildford): The reinforcements in ships which have been sent out to China since the present outbreak consist of: "Goliath," battleship; "Argonaut," "Isis," "Dido," "Marathon," "Wallaroo," "Arethusa," and "Mohawk," cruisers; "Lizard," "Bramble," and "Britomart," gunboats; besides 860 seamen and marines by transport. The despatch of reinforcements will naturally depend upon the course of events. Ten thousand men have been despatched from India, and the troops withdrawn from Hong Kong are being made up. Further troops have been placed under orders in India, and can be immediately despatched if necessity arises. Troops will be available in this country to replace any troops withdrawn.

PROHIBITION OF EXPORTATION OF ARMS.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the Government have taken any steps to prevent the exportation of arms or munitions of war to China by British firms; and, if not, whether immediate steps will be taken.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): As the hon. Member knows, it is impossible in the present state of the law to forbid the importation of munitions of war into China from this country; but the matter seems to the Government to be extremely pressing, and to-day a Bill will be introduced in the House of Lords conferring the necessary powers.

CONSUL GENERAL WARREN.

MR. YERBURGH (Chester): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, in view of the fact that Mr. Warren, the Acting British Consul General at Shanghai, is now the senior representative of British interests in China, and possesses such knowledge of Chinese affairs as will enable him to deal with the Viceroys in the present crisis, the Government are prepared to give him temporary rank as Chargé d'Affaires.

*MR. BRODRICK: Full powers to take all necessary action have been given to Consul General Warren, but it is not considered desirable in the present state of affairs to make the change suggested by the hon. Member.

YANG-TSZE VALLEY—BRITISH PRECAUTIONS.

MR. YERBURGH: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Government are aware that a strong opinion has been expressed at Shanghai that a powerful body of British troops together with transports should be held in readiness at Hong Kong for immediate despatch to the Yang-tsze Valley in case of necessity; and can he state what are the number of troops now at Hong Kong available for such service, and whether they are provided with sufficient transports.

*MR. BRODRICK: The Government are aware that strong views are held at Shanghai and other Yang-tsze ports as to the desirability of sending ships and troops for the protection of Europeans, but there is not unanimity of opinion as to the effect of such action. Troops are now rapidly arriving from India. The officers commanding the troops at Hong Kong and Wei-hai-wei have been directed to place themselves in direct communication with the Consul General at Shanghai with a view of meeting any emergency.

MR. YERBURGH: The right hon. Gentleman has not answered the last part of my question, as to the number of troops available and the supply of transports.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): Will the Government consider the alternative of withdrawing all British subjects in this region to Hong Kong?

[No answer was given.]

REPORTED MASSACRE OF MISSIONARIES IN SHAN-SI.

MR. JOHN WILSON (Falkirk Burghs): I wish to ask the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs whether the statement is true, which has appeared in one paper, that sixty missionaries have been massacred in Shan-si.

*MR. BRODRICK: I have seen the statement which appeared in one paper, but Her Majesty's Government have no confirmation of it, and we are in hopes that it may not be correct.

BRITISH NAVAL FORCE ON THE YANG-TSZE RIVER.

MR. JOSEPH WALTON: I wish to ask whether the Under Secretary for

Foreign Affairs can state the number and class of ships on the Yang-tsze River?

*MR. BRODRICK: Sixteen of Her Majesty's ships are at present employed on the Yang-tsze and its vicinity, and are being moved from day to day to meet the constantly changing conditions. The senior naval officer is at Woosung, and is in close communication with the Consul General at Shanghai. It is not desirable that the exact positions of Her Majesty's ships on the China Station should be specified during the present critical condition of affairs.

BRITISH TROOPS IN INDIA.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he will state what number of the 22,000 troops at present drawn from the India establishment for foreign service are British troops and what will be the number of British troops in India subject to these deductions.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord G. HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): The number of British troops at present withdrawn from the Indian establishment for foreign service is about 8,600. The actual number of British troops in India, allowing for these deductions, is about 61,000.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—ARMY MEDICAL DEPARTMENT — SUPPOSED PLEDGE OF SECRECY IMPOSED ON CIVIL SURGEONS.

DR. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, W.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary for War a question of which I have given him private notice—namely, whether it is a fact, as stated by the hon. Member for Westminster in the daily press, that civil surgeons employed in military hospitals in South Africa have been required by the Army Medical Department to sign a contract not to divulge in any way what their impressions may be on hospital matters.

*THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR WAR (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): Civil surgeons have to sign a contract—not being enrolled or amenable to discipline under the Army Act—accepting the terms offered and the obligation of discipline therein set out. I have in my hand a copy of the contract. The only paragraphs that bear upon discipline are as follows—

"During the said period I will devote my whole time and professional skill to my service hereunder, and will obey all orders given to me by commissioned military or naval officers, or by the permanent medical officers of either of those services."

And the next paragraph runs—

"In case I shall complete my service hereunder to your satisfaction in all respects, I shall receive at the end of the said period a gratuity of two months full pay at the rate hereinbefore specified; but in case I shall in any manner misconduct myself, or shall be (otherwise than through illness or unavoidable accident) unfit in any respect for service hereunder, of which misconduct or unfitness you shall be sole judge, you shall be at liberty from and immediately after such misconduct or unfitness to discharge me from further service hereunder, and thereupon all pay and allowances hereunder shall cease, and I shall not be entitled to any free passage home or gratuity."

That is the only contract civil surgeons have to sign, and for my part I cannot discover any foundation for the statement in question.

*MR. BURDETT-COUTTS (Westminster): Arising out of the answer of the hon. Member, I desire to ask him a question which contains a correction of detail, but adds I think very largely to the force and significance of the statement to which the hon. Member for West Aberdeenshire refers. It is this—whether it is not the case that after some letters had been published from doctors in South African hospitals they had to sign a declaration to the effect that they were not to communicate their impressions of hospital matters to the public, or that they were to take the consequences?

*MR. WYNDHAM: I have no knowledge to any such effect. The contract I have read is the only contract we have, and I am unaware of any other contract whatever.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): On that point it may be desirable to communicate by telegraph with South Africa as to whether this declaration exists or was enforced.

*MR. WYNDHAM: There is no objection whatever.

BATTLE OF THE TUGELA—COL. LONG AND SIR REDVERS BULLER — DESPATCHES.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he can state why the explanation of Colonel Long, R.A., with reference to the circumstances under which the guns were lost at the battle of the Tugela, has been withheld from the public, having regard to the fact that Sir Redvers Buller in his despatch or communication with reference to the capture of these guns, while throwing on Colonel Long the responsibility of the mishap, stated that he was too ill at the time to give any explanation; and whether, in justice to Colonel Long, who has been censured without having been heard in his defence, Colonel Long's statement, which has been for a considerable time in the possession of the authorities, will be immediately published.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I understand that it is not the practice to publish communications of the kind to which the hon. Member refers.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that Sir Redvers Buller said that Colonel Long had no opportunity to give his own account of the transaction? Now that the account has been given, why not publish it in justice to Colonel Long?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Because it is not usual to publish documents of that kind. I do not know why the rule should be departed from in this case.

SOUTH AFRICAN BLUE-BOOK.

CAPTAIN DONELAN (Cork, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can say whether any steps were taken with a view to substantiate the statements contained in letters addressed to the *Times of Natal* and the *Natal Mercury* by private individuals previous to their insertion in the Blue-book on South African affairs just issued; and whether it is customary to publish uncorroborated newspaper correspondence in Blue-books.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): There is nothing unusual in the publication of newspaper correspondence. The first letter is corroborated by Sir R. Buller's telegram published at page 154; the second by a declaration by Mr. Kennard, made before the Resident Commissioner of Basutoland.

CAPTAIN DONELAN: Do not the statements appearing in South African papers require confirmation, in view of the fact that South Africa has earned for itself the title of the "land of lies"?

BOER TREATMENT OF PRISONERS AT PRETORIA.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether he has received any report from Lord Roberts since the release of the prisoners of war at Pretoria as to the treatment accorded to them during their confinement; if he has, what is the purport of it, and when the despatches on the subject will be laid upon the Table of the House.

*MR. WYNDHAM: No such report has been received from Lord Roberts.

REINFORCEMENTS—STATISTICS.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if he will state the number of troops sent to South Africa since 5th June.

*MR. WYNDHAM: 12,203 officers and men.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: How many were Regulars?

*MR. WYNDHAM: All, I think; but I cannot pledge myself to that.

BOER WOMEN SENT BACK TO ENEMY'S LINES.

MR. C. P. SCOTT (Lancashire, Leigh): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether a proclamation has been issued at Pretoria under which such women as are believed to be the wives of men who are fighting against us are to be driven into the enemy's lines; whether among these women are any who have been rendered destitute through the burning of their farms and crops; and whether the proclamation will be enforced against children as well as women.

*MR. WYNDHAM: No intimation to this effect has been received at the War Office.

RESERVE MEDICAL OFFICERS—PROMOTION REGULATIONS.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether paragraph 670, Royal Warrant for Pay and Promotion, which provides that Army Reserve officers shall during their employment on Army service be eligible for promotion, applies to Army medical officers; and if this paragraph does not apply to these officers, what are the grounds of their exclusion from its benefits.

*MR. WYNDHAM: The article in question applies to Army medical officers.

CAMDEN FORT (CORK) GUN FATALITY.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to the inquest held on the 15th instant upon the body of Gunner John Addis, of the South Cork Artillery Militia, who was killed on Monday by the bursting of the breech of a 40-pounder gun at Camden Fort, county Cork; whether the gun was one of four that were injured before, whether it was an out-of date pattern and had been condemned, and whether he can state what precautions are taken to test guns before artillery practice is entered upon; and whether, in view of the circumstances of the case, the War Office will duly compensate the relatives of the deceased gunner, and also the other gunners who were wounded, one of them dangerously, upon that occasion.

*MR. WYNDHAM: The matter referred to by the hon. Member will be inquired into.

MR. FLYNN: How soon shall we know the result?

*MR. WYNDHAM: We have had one report, but it is considered necessary to have an expert opinion on the gun. I anticipate receiving that report at no distant date.

MR. FLYNN: I will put another question down.

2ND KENT ARTILLERY VOLUNTEERS—EASTER CAMP ALLOWANCE.

SIR FRANCIS EVANS (Southampton): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that the War Office, by a letter written early this month, informed the officer commanding the 2nd Kent Volunteer Artillery that the allowances paid for the Easter camp would be deducted at the settlement of the special camp accounts; and whether, in view of the charges which would thereby be thrown upon the corps should they attend the special camp, he could see his way to forego the deduction of the Easter camp charge, amounting to over £400, and so enable this corps, which is up to its full strength, to attend the special camp.

*MR. WYNDHAM: As the corps was specially required in connection with a scheme of mobilisation, the Secretary of State for War has sanctioned the issue of allowances for the Easter camp.

RIFLE CLUBS—GOVERNMENT ALLOWANCES.

MR. GODDARD (Ipswich): On behalf of the hon. Member for Mid Norfolk, I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether the Government is prepared to facilitate the formation and success of rifle clubs by allowing fifty rounds of ammunition per man free, by granting the free use of Government ranges when not required by the Army and Reserve forces, by supplying condemned Lee-Enfield rifles for Morris tube practice, and by issuing Lee-Enfield service rifles in the proportion of one to every ten members without charge to the club.

*MR. WYNDHAM: The Government will allow to authorised rifle clubs ammunition at cost price up to 100 rounds per member, and Lee-Enfield rifles at cost price in the proportion of one for every ten members. The question of Morris tube rifles has not been raised by the National Rifle Association, through which the War Office is dealing with these clubs. The question of the terms on which the use of Government ranges can be given is under consideration.

SOUTH DENES (YARMOUTH) CAMP—SISTERS OF NAZARETH.

DR. TANNER: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if he

is aware of the fact that the only application made to visit the Camp, South Denes, Yarmouth, was that made by the Sisters of Nazareth, highly commended in South Africa; and what explanation has been given by Colonel Commanding Brownrigg for their being turned away from the camp now containing 1,000 Roman Catholic Volunteers.

*MR. WYNDHAM: I am prepared to inquire into this matter.

DR. TANNER: Is the hon. Gentleman aware there are 1,000 Catholic troops in this camp, and that no objection was offered by the men to the visits of these sisters?

[No answer was given.]

VOLUNTEER ENGINEER CORPS FOR SOUTH EAST LANCASHIRE.

SIR J. W. MACLURE (Lancashire, Stretford): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War, seeing that a communication was received by the War Office on or about the 18th May, inquiring whether sanction would be given for the formation of a Volunteer Corps of Engineers in South East Lancashire, including Manchester, Salford, and neighbouring towns, and that the assurance was given that over 1,000 men connected with the engineering and allied trades had promised to join and to conform with the Volunteer Regulations Act, whether any definite reply has been given; and, if not, can he state whether the necessary sanction and consent of the War Office will be granted for the formation of the proposed corps if all the necessary conditions and requirements are properly undertaken.

*MR. WYNDHAM: The question is under the consideration of the general officer commanding North Western District, with whom the persons proposing to raise the corps have been requested to correspond.

SENIOR NAVAL LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY—OFFICIAL RESIDENCE.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: On behalf of the noble Lord the Member for Roxburgh (Earl of DALKEITH), I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether, in view of the importance of the First Sea Lord living at the Admiralty in order to enable him to deal with urgent matters of pressing necessity that arise after office hours, Her Majesty's Government have considered the necessity for providing a residence for him in the Admiralty buildings, or adjacent to them; and, if not, will they undertake to consider it.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. GOSCHEN, St. George's, Hanover Square): The Government have under consideration a plan for meeting the demand for a residence for the Senior Naval Lord in the vicinity of the Admiralty, and it is hoped that it may be brought to a successful conclusion.

NAVAL EMERGENCY COAL CONTRACTS.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the Admiralty, if he will state why coal was taken under emergency contracts for the Naval manœuvres in 1888, and why none has been taken since; whether the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty, as sole judges of the circumstances constituting anticipated or actual war under which contractors shall be called upon to supply on emergency contracts, have decided that the military operations in South Africa and in China are not circumstances such as would constitute actual or anticipated war; and if it be the intention of the Admiralty not to carry out their emergency contracts when the state of the coal market enables them to do better without them, will he in future see that this is notified to the contractors before the contracts are entered into.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. MACARTNEY, Antrim, N.): Coals for the manœuvres were included in the emergency contracts until 1899. Since then they have been brought under separate contracts, that being, in the opinion of the Admiralty, the preferable course. It has not been considered necessary to come to any such decision as that indicated in the hon. Member's question, coal for China and South Africa being provided for in the ordinary way. With regard to the last paragraph, the question of what notification shall be given to contractors is being considered.

BRITISH CENTRAL AFRICA—CHIROMO AND LAKE NYASSA RAILWAY.

*SIR BRAMPTON GURDON (Norfolk, N.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, if it be impossible to assist the British Central African Protectorate with a direct grant, Her Majesty's Government will be prepared to guarantee a loan for the construction of a railway from Chiromo to Lake Nyassa.

*MR. BRODRICK: Her Majesty's Government are not prepared at present to undertake such a railway, or to guarantee a loan for its construction.

MAURITIUS—BRITISH CENTRAL AFRICA RIFLES.

*SIR BRAMPTON GURDON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can state when the Papers with reference to the disturbances in connection with the British Central Africa Rifles, when quartered in Mauritius, will be laid before the House.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: It is not proposed to lay any Papers on this subject before Parliament.

*SIR BRAMPTON GURDON: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that I have had letters from Lord Selborne and the Under Secretary of State for War promising that these Papers should be laid on the Table?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: No, Sir; I was not aware of that.

*SIR BRAMPTON GURDON: Will the right hon. Gentleman verify my statement? I do not expect him to believe it on my word.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Of course I entirely accept the statement of the hon. Member, and I will make inquiries into the subject. But the matter has been further considered; and I am not prepared to say now that I will produce Papers on the subject. I do not think it would be in the public interest that I should do so.

AUSTRALIAN COMMONWEALTH—GOVERNOR GENERAL'S RESIDENCE.

MR. HOGAN (Tipperary, Mid): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether it has been decided to swear the Governor General in at Sydney, and to inaugurate the Australian Commonwealth in that city; whether Sydney will also be the official residence of the Governor General until the establishment of the permanent Federal capital; and whether the inconveniences likely to arise from the Governor General residing in Sydney, while the Federal Parliament has to meet in Melbourne, have been taken into consideration.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The answer to the first part of the hon. Member's question is in the affirmative. The Government of New South Wales has been informed that if the other colonies agree, Her Majesty's Government will not object to the Governor General residing at Sydney while the Federal Parliament is not sitting, but that the matter must be subject to the decision of the Federal Administration. While the Federal Parliament is sitting at Melbourne the Governor General will, of course, reside there.

INDIAN FAMINE—CHOLERA DEATHS.

MR. C. P. SCOTT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India if he can state the total number of deaths from cholera in the famine districts, including the native States, since the beginning of the famine.

LORD G. HAMILTON: I have not yet received full statistics of cholera deaths in British districts and native States since the beginning of the famine. When cholera became severely epidemic, I asked for weekly telegrams regarding the ravages; and in my answer yesterday I quoted the totals of the figures given in those telegrams which are published with the famine telegrams in the newspapers.

FAMINE CAMPS—MEDICAL STAFF.

MR. C. P. SCOTT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether the services of more than one medical man have been available at most of the large famine camps, containing from 20,000 to 30,000 people, at any time during the famine or since the outbreak of cholera.

LORD G. HAMILTON: I have not received details as to the individual distribution of medical officers and medical subordinates at the different relief camps and relief houses. The Famine Codes

contain full instructions for strengthening the medical staff in famine districts, for provision of hospital accommodation on relief works, for posting a medical officer or a subordinate qualified for independent charge to each hospital, for the duties of such medical officers. The instructions as to engaging additional medical officers and subordinates from outside the regular service, when need arises, are full and clear.

RAILWAY PASSENGERS' LUGGAGE.

MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he will lay upon the Table of the House the correspondence relating to the excess charges on passengers' luggage.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): The correspondence is at present by no means complete. When it is I will consider the propriety of laying it on the Table.

WATER GAS REGULATIONS

MR. J. W. WILSON (Worcestershire, N.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether, having regard to the Report and recommendations last year of the Departmental Committee appointed in 1898 to inquire into the manufacture and use of water gas, and also to the fact that such gas, made from coke and oil instead of coal, is being increasingly and profitably produced by gas companies, whilst local authorities owning their own gas works are now debarred from laying out such plant, owing to the refusal of the Local Government Board to sanction loans for this purpose until the regulations recommended for the use of carburetted water gas are laid down, the Board of Trade will take steps to frame such rules and regulations at an early date.

MR. RITCHIE: The Board of Trade cannot give effect to the recommendations of the Departmental Committee by rules and regulations. Legislation would be necessary, and on this point I can only say, as I did in reply to a question put by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Stepney, on the 25th May, that in any general legislation my right hon. friends, the Secretary of State for the Home Department and the President of the Local Government Board, would probably have a larger interest than the Board of Trade, and that I cannot make any promise on the subject.

MR. J. W. WILSON was understood to ask: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that in a great number of towns water gas is being supplied in excess of the regulation amount?

MR. RITCHIE: No, Sir; but if the hon. Gentleman can give me any information I shall be happy to consider it.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): May I ask whether it is not a fact that analysis showed that in Dublin 20 per cent. of water gas was used contrary to the recommendations of the Home Office Committee?

MR. RITCHIE: I shall inquire into that.

BRITISH AND AMERICAN COAL EXPORTS.

MR. D. A. THOMAS: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he can state the quantities of coal shipped from this country and from the United States respectively during the eleven months ending 31st May last, to France, to Germany, and to other European countries.

MR. RITCHIE: The exports of coal, coke, etc., from the United Kingdom to the countries named in the eleven months ending 31st May, 1900, were as follows:—France, 6,969,313 tons; Germany, 4,973,634 tons; other parts of Europe, approximately 19,000,000 tons. The amounts of coal exported from the United States to these countries in the same period were:—France, 26,336 tons; Germany, 2,126 tons; other parts of Europe, 136,645 tons.

FIRE BRIGADES COMMITTEE—PREMATURE PUBLICATION OF REPORT.

SIR GEORGE FARDELL (Paddington, S.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary for Home Affairs whether his attention has been drawn to the publication in *The Times* to-day of the principal recommendations contained in the Report of the Committee on Fire Brigades before the Report has been laid on the Table of the House and circulated, and if he will, as

chairman, inform the House how this confidential document has been obtained by *The Times*.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. JESSE COLLINGS, Birmingham, Bordesley): I have seen the publication to which my hon. friend refers, and am sorry I can give him no information whatever as to how or by whom that information was given. The last act of the Committee before separating was to pledge themselves that they would give no information whatever on the subject until the Report was printed and in the hands of Members.

YORK POSTAL STAFF—ASSISTANT INSPECTOR OF POSTMEN.

MR. STEADMAN (Tower Hamlets, Stepney): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he is aware that an assistant inspector of postmen at York who, although he has passed sixty years of age, has had his period of service extended another five years, is allowed to keep a shop with a beer off-licence; and whether this is in accordance with the rules of the Department.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. HANBURY, Preston): When the assistant inspector of postmen referred to attained the age of sixty in April, 1899, he was reported to be efficient in the discharge of his duties, and it was decided that he might remain for the present—not for any specified number of years. As he had been in possession of the off-licence for upwards of twenty years without the knowledge of the Department, it was not, in view of his early retirement, which will very shortly take place, considered necessary to require him to relinquish it.

LIVERPOOL POST OFFICE—PROMOTIONS.

MR. STEADMAN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that a clerk in the Liverpool Postal Department has been promoted to be a superintendent after twenty-five years service, and that sixty-nine telegraphists in the Liverpool Office are awaiting promotion to the clerks class, some of them having over thirty years service, many of them being established telegraphists at the time the recently promoted officer was a corporal of messengers; and whether, in view of the Fawcett Scheme and the Tweedmouth Committee deciding that the Postal and Telegraphic branches of the Post Office should be placed on an equality, the Postmaster General will take steps to carry this into effect.

MR. HANBURY: This post of assistant superintendent on the postal side of the office was filled by the promotion of a clerk employed on postal duties who was reported to be the best qualified for the position. None of the sixty-nine telegraphists to whom the hon. Member refers would have been capable of performing the duties of the clerkship vacated by the promoted officer. The Postmaster General takes every opportunity to equalise as far as possible the prospects on the postal and telegraphic sides; but cases must always occur in which promotion is more rapid on one side than on the other.

CENTRAL TELEGRAPH OFFICE—DINNER INTERVALS.

MR. STEADMAN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that a number of telegraphists in the cable room, Central Telegraph Office, have been punished for exceeding the thirty minutes allowed for meal relief by one or two minutes; and that the plea of delay in the refreshment branch has been held unsatisfactory in the case of an officer who was supplied with bad meat, and needed the food changed; and whether, seeing that the dinner period is the only relief time permitted in duties which are frequently of ten and twelve hours duration, the Postmaster General will authorise a relaxation of the rule.

MR. HANBURY: No telegraphist in the cable room of the Central Telegraph Office has been punished for exceeding his dinner time—thirty minutes—under the circumstances stated in the question. When the delay has been three minutes and upwards he has been admonished; and frequent repetitions of these delays have been punished by the infliction of extra duty. But when they are proved to have arisen from causes over which the telegraphist had no control the excess time is excused. In the absence of

particulars of the case to which the hon. Member refers, the Postmaster General is unable to give any information. In his opinion no relaxation of the rule, as I have stated it, is called for.

HARWICH POST OFFICE STAFF.

MR. GODDARD: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether a female telegraphist in the Harwich post office has been informed that she must be transferred from that office, and proceed at her own expense to the Enfield office; whether she is able to adequately perform all the duties of the Harwich office that are allocated to the female staff; and whether the Postmaster General will investigate the case with a view to provide against the telegraphist being compelled to attend the Enfield post office, and in the event of a transfer, that the Department will bear the cost of the removal.

MR. HANBURY: The late postmaster of Harwich had five of his relatives employed under him at the Harwich office. It is not desirable in the interest of efficient control that the staff of an office should consist to any large extent of persons who are related to one another, and it has accordingly been decided to make certain transfers of staff from Harwich to other offices. One of these transfers is that to which the hon. Member refers, and it is not proposed to alter the decision arrived at. The telegraphist concerned was wrongly informed by the present Postmaster that she would have to bear her own removal expenses. They will be defrayed up to a reasonable amount by the Department.

MR. GODDARD: Does not this telegraphist suffer some depreciation of salary by the change?

MR. HANBURY: I understand not.

NORTH DEVON NIGHT MAILS.

SIR CAMERON GULL (Devonshire, Barnstaple): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that the night mails for North Devon are sent on from Exeter by luggage train, and that owing to the delay so caused and to the refusal of the Post Office to adopt the method of railway sub-offices more generally, letters are not delivered in the outlying country districts until late in the morning, and whether he will take steps to expedite the train service and to adopt in more cases railway sub-offices.

MR. HANBURY: The question of improving the night mail service to country districts in North Devon is under consideration. The cost of substituting a faster train from Exeter for that now used would be considerable, and the Postmaster General fears that such an alteration would be quite impracticable. It may be possible, however, to effect some acceleration of the local services, and the Postmaster General has caused a communication to be addressed to the local railway company enquiring what would be the cost of improving the Lynton service. If any means are found practicable for improving the postal services to Lynton and Hartland they will be readily adopted.

IMPERIAL GRANTS IN AID OF EDUCATION.

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education if he can state approximately the amount which England received from the Imperial Exchequer during the financial year last ended in respect of the operation of the Voluntary Schools Act, 1897, and the Elementary Education Act, 1897.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL ON EDUCATION (Sir J. GORST, Cambridge University): The amount for England and Wales was, under the first-named Act, £621,516 4s. 11d.; and under the second, £210,896 11s. 11d.

MR. CALDWELL: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate if he can state approximately the amount which Scotland received from the Imperial Exchequer during the financial year last ended in respect of the operation of the Education (Scotland) Act, 1897.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): The grants paid in respect of the operation of the Education (Scotland) Act, 1897, are: (1) the additional grant to school boards

under Section 67 of the Act of 1872, as amended by Section 1 of the Act of 1897. The total paid under this head in the financial year last ended was £44,137 19s. 9d., of which it is estimated that £24,000 was paid in respect of the operation of the Act of 1897, the remainder having been claimable under the Act of 1872. And (2) the aid grant to Voluntary schools, amounting to £12,184 0s. 6d.

FEES IN SCOTTISH UNIVERSITIES.

MR. THOMAS SHAW (Hawick Burghs): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate what is the amount of the fees paid by class students in each of the Universities of Scotland; and whether Her Majesty's Government are prepared to assent to the printing of a Return on the subject giving the details in accordance with the notice on the Order Paper for to-day.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: I shall be happy to give the hon. and learned Member the replies which have now been received from the Universities, and if, after perusal of those documents, he will confer with the Secretary for Scotland as to the exact form in which he wishes to move for it, the Return will be granted.

POSTAL DELIVERIES IN SOUTH WESTERN SCOTLAND.

SIR MARK STEWART (Kirkcudbrightshire): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if his attention has been called to the continued irregularity of the delivery of newspapers in the South Western District of Scotland, if he will inquire into the cause, and endeavour without further delay to put matters on a better footing.

MR. HANBURY: The Postmaster General is not aware of the continued irregularity in the delivery of newspapers in the South Western District of Scotland to which the hon. Member refers, but if particulars can be given of any delays which have occurred immediate inquiry on the subject shall be made.

SIR MARK STEWART: There are so many cases of delay in the delivery of newspapers for twenty-four hours. Is it not for the Post Office to find out these things for itself?

MR. HANBURY: I cannot answer that, as I do not belong to the Post Office. I will, however, consider the point.

IRISH CENSUS RETURNS.

MR. T. D. SULLIVAN (Donegal, W.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he will have arrangements made in the taking of the census in March, 1901, to obtain a Return of the number of persons in Ireland (being of three years of age or upwards) who speak English only or Irish only, or both Irish and English, in like manner as is required in the Census Bill with regard to the speaking of the Welsh language in Wales and the county of Monmouth.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. G. W. BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): If the hon. Member will refer to the Returns of the last census in Ireland he will observe that they contained statistics of all persons who spoke Irish only, or Irish and English. Similar statistics will be collected and published in connection with the approaching census in Ireland.

MONAGHAN ASYLUM SEWERAGE SCHEME.

MR. DALY (Monaghan, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Governors of the Cavan and Monaghan Lunatic Asylum made a demand last week on the County Council of Monaghan for £6,500 to carry out a sewerage scheme; and that this sum is being expended without letting or offering the work by contract; whether he can state who is superintending the carrying out of this work on the asylum premises; whether he is aware that sewerage schemes costing large sums of the ratepayers' money carried out during recent years have proved a failure in the asylum; and whether he will see that the money of the ratepayers is not allowed to be lost now, and whether a contract for this work could still be taken.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: As stated by me yesterday, the Local Government Board, on the application of the Asylum Committee, have sanctioned the issue of a loan to the amount mentioned for sewerage works at the asylum, the repayment of the loan to be spread over a period of thirty years. I am informed

that the works are being carried out by the employment of tradesmen and labourers under the superintendence of Mr. Peddie, a sanitary engineer of high repute, assisted by a civil engineer as clerk of works. The decision as to the manner in which such works are to be executed is vested solely in the Asylum Committee, and there is no obligation imposed upon them to let or offer the execution of such works by contract. No other sewerage scheme has been carried out at this asylum since it was built thirty-one years ago. It would be the duty of the Local Government auditor to inquire into any expenditure of an illegal or unnecessary character in connection with the asylum.

MASTERSHIP OF THE BELFAST WORKHOUSE.

MR. DALY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Belfast Board of Guardians recently advertised for a master for the workhouse, that a committee of the guardians selected a number of suitable men for the position out of many applicants, and that when the day of election came the question was postponed, which in the opinion of the clerk was illegal; whether he can state the name of the gentleman that the committee thought most suitable for the mastership, and if the guardians will bear the expenses of the candidates who travelled long distances in expectation of the election taking place according to advertisement; and whether he can say what course he intends to adopt in reference to the action of the guardians in not carrying out the election of master of the workhouse on the date fixed.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: The committee appointed by the guardians reported that only eight candidates for the position of master of the workhouse were qualified under the terms of the advertisement, and they recommended the guardians to issue fresh advertisements for candidates. This the guardians decided to do. The Local Government Board have no information as to the statement of opinion attributed to the clerk, or as to the matters referred to in the second paragraph. The Board do not propose to take any action respecting the postponement of the appointment, as the guardians appear to have acted within their powers.

ARREARS OF IRISH SCHOOL GRANTS.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the arrears of National School Grant for 1892, 1893, 1894, and 1895 will be paid only to living teachers, or will the arrears due be paid to the next-of-kin in cases in which the teacher to whom the arrears were due is dead, and whether retired teachers will be paid arrears due.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: If the money be voted by Parliament, an equivalent for the so-called arrears of school grant will, under the sanction of the Treasury, be apportioned among all teachers who were entitled to participate in the residual grant of the four years in question. In the case of those teachers since dead, their representatives will receive the amount payable. The grant will be subject to certain deductions on account of the pension fund.

SNEEM NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the National school teacher at Sneem, county Kerry, has offered at a loss to himself the necessary site for a teacher's residence, and that the only obstacle to the erection of the teacher's residence is that the Local Government Board and the local landlord cannot agree as to the suitability of the site; and whether the Government will use its influence to compel, if necessary, the Local Government Board and the local landlord to come to such an arrangement as will allow the erection of this residence to be proceeded with.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: My right hon. friend the Attorney General for Ireland replied very fully to a question addressed to him on this subject on the 9th February last.* To that reply I have nothing to add except to say that no correspondence has taken place with the Local Government Board on the subject.

* See *The Parliamentary Debates* [Fourth Series], Vol. lxxviii., page 1056.

IRISH NATIONAL TEACHERS' CLASS SALARY.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in awarding the future income of first and second class National teachers who, owing to epidemics and severity of the weather, did not receive their full class salary for the last three years and whose results fees and residual grant were lessened in consequence, the Commissioners of National Education make due allowances for those diminutions of salary.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: The hon. Member on referring to Clause 20 of the New Rules will observe that cases in which the Commissioners may deem it inequitable to fix the future incomes of the teachers on the basis of their average incomes for the past three years will be specially considered.

IRISH NATIONAL TEACHERS — NEW SCALE OF SALARIES, CLASSIFICATION, PROMOTIONS, ETC.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland will he explain why the future scale of salaries for National teachers is omitted in the extract from the forthcoming rules of the Commissioners presented to Parliament last week; and whether he can state the future scale of salaries; whether he has observed that, by Rules 11, 12, and 13 of this extract, all assistant teachers and highly classed teachers at present in charge of small schools are degraded from the rank they previously won by good service and success at examinations; and whether he will advise the Commissioners of National Education to rule that every teacher at present in the service shall continue to retain his classification, and to be described officially as of his present rank until promoted or depressed by the rules which were in force when he won that class; whether he is aware that, by the operation of the same rules, teachers in small schools are made ineligible for promotion, and thereby prevented from qualifying for the pension of a higher class to which they were formerly entitled to aspire; and if he can take any steps to remedy this alleged grievance.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: The future scale of salaries is omitted in the extract from the new code of the Commission as it has not yet been fixed by the Commissioners and submitted to the Irish Government and the Treasury. It is impossible to state the future scale of salaries except approximately. It is not true that by Rules 11, 12, and 13 all assistant teachers, and highly-classed teachers at present in charge of small schools, are degraded from the rank they previously won by success at examinations. Every teacher at present in the service will be described officially according to his position in the old class and the new grade in the Annual Register of Teachers. It is impossible to reply to the third paragraph of the question at present, as the necessary modifications of the pension rules have not yet been made.

IRISH INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION— ANNUAL REPORT.

MR. FLYNN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, seeing that the Annual Report of the Commissioners of Intermediate Education, Ireland, does not contain the names of the superintendents of examinations, the Commissioners will consider the advisability of giving the names and professions of these gentlemen in future Reports.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: The suggestion in this question will be brought before the Commissioners of Intermediate Education at their next meeting.

IRISH MONITORS' EXAMINATIONS.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland why the results of the examinations for monitors, held in April last, have not yet been communicated to the candidates, and when will they be informed of the results; and what is the cause of the delay, seeing that over three months have now elapsed.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: The results of the examinations in question will be made known without delay.

IRISH CONVICTS—MULDOWNEY AND FINIGAN.

MR. JOHN ROCHE (Galway, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been drawn to the cases

of two prisoners named Muldowney and Finigan, of Croughwell, who were convicted in Sligo and have been about seventeen years confined; and whether he will review their cases with a view to recommending His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland to grant their discharge.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: The prisoners named in the question were convicted of murder at the Sligo Assizes in August, 1884, and sentenced to death. The sentence was subsequently commuted to one of penal servitude for life. Their cases were under the consideration of the Lord Lieutenant in August of last year, when it was decided that the law must take its course. The case of convict Finigan was again under consideration in November, with a like result. As respects the second paragraph, it is not my province to act as suggested. Any application or memorial praying for a mitigation of sentence should be addressed to the Lord Lieutenant, in whom alone is vested the exercise of the prerogative of mercy.

MR. DILLON: When will these cases come up again in the ordinary course for reconsideration?

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: I cannot say; but if a memorial is presented they are immediately reconsidered.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Does not the Lord Lieutenant act on the advice of his Chief Secretary in exercising the prerogative of mercy?

Mr. G. W. BALFOUR: No, Sir; he does not.

IRISH MARKSMEN AT BISLEY.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a team selected from twenty Irishmen representing all Ireland has won the Elcho Shield at rifle shooting; whether these men are prevented from competing for the Queen's Prize because the law prohibits Volunteer corps in Ireland; and whether he proposes to enrol Volunteers in Ireland or establish rifle clubs where all who so desire may have an opportunity of learning rifle shooting.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: I am aware that the Elcho Shield has been won this year by an Irish team. The second paragraph correctly assumes that legislation would be necessary for the establishment of Volunteer corps in Ireland. The question of the formation of rifle clubs should be addressed to the War Department.

POLICE REGULATIONS AT QUEENSTOWN.

MR. HAYDEN (Roscommon, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether passengers arriving at Queenstown from the United States are asked by a policeman for their names and destination, and these duly noted; whether similar information is taken at Liverpool, Southampton, or any other British port at which American passengers are landed; and if not, why it is obtained at Queenstown, and passengers landing on Irish soil treated differently to those arriving in Great Britain.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: I am informed that the fact is as stated in the first part of the question. The information is freely given by passengers and has only once been refused during the last twelve months. The practice has existed for twenty years. I am unable to say whether similar information is taken at ports outside Ireland.

IRISH LOCAL GOVERNMENT ORDERS.

MR. MAURICE HEALY (Cork): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will lay upon the Table of the House a Return of all rules and orders made or issued under or in consequence of the Local Government (Ireland) Act since last year's Return.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: Yes, the further Return referred to will be laid upon the Table.

MAYO ASSIZES—CONTEMPT OF COURT.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the failure of a motion on behalf of the Crown, made last Tuesday at the Mayo Assizes at Castlebar, to commit Mr. William O'Brien for contempt of court; whether he is aware that, so far back as October, 1882, legislation for the curtailment of the power of arbitrary committal for contempt of court

was promised in the House of Commons by the Prime Minister of the day; and whether, having regard to the remarks of the Chief Justice of England in April, 1896, and to the fact that one man has actually suffered imprisonment for 743 days for that offence, the Government will take steps for the introduction of legislation to define the power of judges to commit for contempt of court, and to render that power subject to appeal.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: With respect to the first paragraph, the article published in the journal named the *Irish People*, in reference to which the application was made, was, in the words of the judge, calculated to prejudice the fair trial of a pending criminal prosecution and to interfere with the fair course of justice, but the failure of the application was due to the fact that though this journal had for months previously been advertised throughout the county Mayo as edited by Mr. William O'Brien, that gentleman, to the astonishment, I think, of everybody, denied on oath that he was editor in the ordinary sense, and repudiated all responsibility for the contents of the paper. As respects the second and third paragraphs, I must refer the hon. Member to my right hon. friend the First Lord of the Treasury.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Did not the learned judge express his regret that he could not grant costs against the Crown?

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: I am told that that is not the case.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: He said he had no statutory power.

CASTLEBAR POST OFFICE.

DR. ROBERT AMBROSE (Mayo, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if he can state whether a site has yet been purchased for a post office in Castlebar, county Mayo; and, if so, what progress has been made with regard to the erection of the proposed building.

MR. HANBURY: The site for a new post office at Castlebar has now been decided upon, and arrangements will be made for building as soon as possible.

CORNALARAGH POSTAL DELIVERIES.

MR. DALY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that letters for some time past have been irregularly delivered in the townland of Cornalaragh, county Monaghan, near Carrickmacross, and district; and whether, seeing that a house to house delivery in this neighbourhood has been long promised, he can state why this promise has not been carried out.

MR. HANBURY: Inquiry shall at once be made as regards the postal delivery in the townland of Cornalaragh, and as good a service shall be afforded as the circumstances warrant.

GREAGHLONE LETTER BOX.

MR. DALY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that the letter box at Mr. Francis Lambe's, Greaghlone, Carrickmacross, county Monaghan, has not been visited by a postman for several days past; and, whether he can explain the reason of this neglect, and if he will take steps that this state of things will not occur again in this thickly populated district.

MR. HANBURY: The Postmaster General regrets that, owing to a local misunderstanding, the letter box at Greaghlone was not cleared for some days recently. Direetions have been given for the box to be cleared regularly in future and at a later hour than formerly.

PHŒNIX PARK, DUBLIN—ORNAMENTAL WATERS, TREES, ETC.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether any step has been taken to ascertain the cost of providing a lake in the Phœnix Park such as is provided to enhance public enjoyment in Hyde Park and St. James's Park, and what are the respective areas of these three parks.

MR. HANBURY: An estimate is being prepared, but important questions arise as to the source from which water should be taken and on other points which cannot be settled without some delay. The Board of Works are looking into the subject thoroughly. The area of the Phœnix Park is 1,752 acres. The area of Hyde Park is 360 acres, and of St. James's Park 93 acres.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he would ask the keepers of the London parks to furnish the keeper of Phœnix Park with a list of the ornamental trees and shrubs grown in St. James's Park and the Green Park, and give authority for any expense that may be entailed in providing for the planting of similar trees and shrubs in Phœnix Park.

MR. HANBURY: A list of the ornamental trees and shrubs which have done well in the London parks shall be sent to the Board of Works, who will decide how far they are suitable for the Phœnix Park also.

SNEEM PIER.

MR. FLAVIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Congested Districts Board have built a pier at Sneem, county Kerry, at a cost of £1,500, and that a goods store is a necessity on or near the pier for the protection and storage of goods; whether he is aware that the Congested Districts Board, the trading companies calling at the pier, and the people of the locality were prepared to erect this store, and that the erection of the storehouse was prevented by Mr. Warden, the local landlord; and, can he state what steps the Government will take to compel Mr. Warden to allow the goods store to be built for protection of goods and use of the trading public.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOR IRELAND (Mr. PLUNKETT, Dublin Co., S.): The Congested Districts Board, in 1898, built a quay at Sneem, at a cost of £1,158. The Board proposed, in May, 1899, to erect a shed on the quay for the accommodation of the public, but decided to take no further steps in the matter on learning from Mr. Warden that the owners of the property adjoining the quay contemplated building a store themselves. No representations have since been made to the board on the matter. The Government have no power to take any steps such as suggested in the last paragraph.

MR. FLAVIN: Can the right hon. Gentleman say what objection Mr. Warden has to the Congested Districts Board building a store?

MR. PLUNKETT: We do not know that Mr. Warden has any objection. We have received no representations from the district.

IMPORTS OF RUSSIAN EGGS.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture for Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the importation of Russian eggs into Ireland, and their subsequent exportation as Irish eggs to England; and whether he will cause inquiries to be made as to this system, and take steps to prevent its continuance.

MR. PLUNKETT: The attention of the Department has been drawn to the recent representations in the public press as to the alleged importation of Russian eggs into Ireland, and their subsequent exportation as Irish eggs. The matter is being inquired into.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: Will the right hon. Gentleman see that these eggs do not reach the House of Commons?

MR. PLUNKETT: That is the duty of the Kitchen Committee.

AGRICULTURE—THE WARBLE FLY.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture for Ireland whether his Department has issued leaflets to stock-owners containing instructions to prevent the warble fly from harassing and injuring cattle; and whether he intends to introduce legislation making it a penal offence for stock-owners to omit taking simple precautions to prevent the suffering caused by the warble fly to cattle and the loss to the sellers and buyers of hides.

MR. PLUNKETT: A leaflet has been issued by the Department containing instructions how to prevent the warble fly from harassing and injuring cattle. I do not think this pest can be dealt with by legislation.

HAGUE CONFERENCE—RATIFICATION OF CONVENTION.

MR. J. A. PEASE (Northumberland, Tyneside): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes Convention, signed at the Hague, has been yet ratified by the Powers of

Europe; if not, when is the Convention expected to be ratified.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The ratifications of Great Britain, France, Austro-Hungary, Russia, Italy, Spain, and the United States are at present in the custody of the Netherlands Government, but the date of the ratification has not yet been definitely settled. It will probably be early in September.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Can the Leader of the House now state anything definite as to the business on Tuesday, and also when the Supplementary Army Estimate will be in the hands of Members? It ought to be in our hands a considerable time before the statement is made.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: On Tuesday I find it is impossible for my right hon. friend the Secretary for the Colonies to have the Papers in the hands of Members in sufficient time to discuss the Colonial Office Vote. My original arrangement would, therefore, appear to be satisfactory—namely, to take the Colonial Office Vote on Tuesday next.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: When shall we have the Papers?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I hope they will be in the hands of Members on Monday morning.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The Papers requisite to discuss the Foreign Office Vote cannot be in the hands of Members in time for the discussion on Tuesday, and therefore I will not put down the Vote for that day. It will in all probability stand first on the last day of Supply, probably Thursday week. I will put down after the Colonial Office Vote the other Votes in Class II. My hon. friend the Under Secretary for War hopes to have the terms of the Supplementary Estimate in the hands of Members on Monday, but, in any case, on Tuesday.

MR. BUCHANAN (Aberdeenshire, E.): Will there be any opportunity of discussing the Ashanti Vote?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: That will come after the Colonial Vote, as usual.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION BILL.

Reported from the Standing Committee on Law, etc., without Amendment.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 292.]

Minutes of Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 292.]

Bill to be read the third time upon Monday next.

BOILERS REGISTRATION AND INSPECTION.

Report from the Select Committee, with Minutes of Evidence and an Appendix, brought up, and read.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 294.]

BOROUGH FUNDS BILL.

Order [this day] for Consideration, as amended (by the Standing Committee), read, and discharged; Bill withdrawn.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Poor Removal Bill, Charitable Loans (Ireland) Bill, Veterinary Surgeons Amendment Bill, without amendment.

That they have agreed to—Amendments to Land Charges Bill [Lords], without amendment.

That they have passed a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Law relating to County Courts in Ireland." County Courts (Ireland) Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Law relating to registration in Provincial and Diocesan Registries." Diocesan Registration Bill [Lords.]

Also a Bill intituled, "An Act to relieve Members of County Councils and other Local Authorities from disqualification by reason of absence in certain cases." Members of Local Authorities Relief Bill [Lords].

NEW BILLS.

MEDICAL ACT (1858) EXTENSION.

Bill to extend the provisions of the Medical Act, 1858, ordered to be brought in by General Laurie, Mr. Rothschild, Sir Mancherjee Bhownaggree, Colonel Wyndham Murray, Mr. Middlemore, and Sir James Fergusson.

MEDICAL ACT (1858) EXTENSION BILL.

"To extend the provisions of the Medical Act, 1858," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Wednesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 307.]

RAILWAY AND CANAL TRAFFIC ACTS AMENDMENT.

Bill to amend the Railway and Canal Traffic Acts, 1854, 1873, and 1888, ordered to be brought in by Sir Thomas Gibson-Carmichael, Mr. Hedderwick, Mr. Arnold-Forster, Mr. Griffith-Boscawen, and Mr. Yoxall.

RAILWAY AND CANAL TRAFFIC ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

"To amend the Railway and Canal Traffic Acts, 1854, 1873, and 1888," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Friday next, and to be printed. [Bill 308.]

TEACHERS OF MUSIC REGISTRATION.

Bill for the registration of Teachers of Music, ordered to be brought in by Mr. J. W. Sidebotham, Sir Henry Bemrose, Sir John Brunner, Mr. Alban Gibbs, Sir William Houldsworth, and Mr. Provand.

TEACHERS OF MUSIC REGISTRATION BILL.

"For the registration of Teachers of Music," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday, 30th July, and to be printed. [Bill 309.]

SUPPLY [20TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1900–1901.

CLASS IV.

1. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £787,503 (including a Supplementary sum of £95,434) be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Expenses of the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland, including a Grant in Aid of the Teachers' Pension Fund, Ireland."

*MR. O'MALLEY (Galway, Connemara): I rise, Sir, for the purpose of bringing before the Committee the unsatisfactory condition of primary education in Ireland. This House has given, and rightly given, a great deal of its time and attention to the question of education in Great Britain, and it will be admitted that vast progress has been made for the last thirty years towards educational perfection in England, Scotland, and Wales. Old methods and old systems have given way to new methods and new systems, and although the change has been slow, it has been sure and steady, and to-day the British people of all grades, and especially the poorer portion of the people, enjoy an excellent, if not a perfect, system of education. I believe that England is still behind the Continental countries in educational matters, but from year to year this House gives effect to legislation in the direction of improving it, and it may be said with truth that to-day the people of England, Scotland, and Wales have little to complain upon this question. But, Sir, how stands the case of Ireland? That is the question I wish to bring under the notice of the Committee, and I ask for its indulgence while I attempt to do so. I have seen what has been done for education in these countries within the last thirty years—old ideas and systems, as I have said, giving way to new ideas and systems; but in Ireland I have seen, during all those years, old-fashioned ideas and old-fashioned and stupid systems maintained and adhered to with, I may say, surprising tenacity and obstinacy. The same books that were in use in the so-called National schools when I was a boy are in use there to-day. One set of school books, one system of examination, one narrow set of ideas, one narrow groove. It is true that in their new rules just laid before Parliament the Commissioners have some important and satisfactory changes; but while the countries of the whole world have been for years alive to the necessity and importance of education, the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland have remained ignorant or indifferent to the necessity and importance of having the people of Ireland properly and intelligently educated. But,

Sir, I do not purpose discussing in detail the out-of-date and stupid National school system of education in Ireland, nor shall I criticise the new rules. There is one phase of it, and one alone, that I want to dwell upon to-day, and that is the policy of the Commissioners of Education in ignoring the advantages of the bilingual system of instruction in those parts of Ireland where the Irish language is in general use and may be said to be the home language. Hon. Gentlemen in this House who know anything of the Welsh educational system, or who have acquired other languages than their own, will recognise the necessity and the advantage of the bilingual system, and although its importance has been urged, and strongly urged, upon the Irish Educational Commissioners, this old-fashioned and obsolete body ignore the representations made to them on this matter; and therefore, Sir, we are compelled to bring this all-important and vital subject for the proper education of our people before this Parliament. Hon. Members may be aware that this Irish language question has engaged and is engaging the anxious attention of the people of Ireland. It is a most important question, and the sooner Parliament realises that fact and deals with it the better.

We look at this question from two standpoints. We believe that as a separate entity, if I may say so; as a separate and distinct nationality; as a Celtic people, we should speak our own Celtic language. I shall not go into the policy and the methods adopted by this country in the past in penalising the Irish language, but the Irish people are now determined to restore that language as far as it is in their power to do so, so that future generations of Irishmen will be able to speak their own language just as the people of Wales to-day speak their Welsh tongue. This Parliament can help in that direction, and this Parliament is bound to recognise and respect—if it acts constitutionally—the wishes of the Irish people. That is our first standpoint. The second standpoint from which we view this question is the urgent necessity for properly educating our children in those Irish-speaking districts where Irish is the home language. The present system is altogether wrong in principle and most pernicious in its effects. It is utterly impossible to acquire a proper knowledge of the subjects taught in those schools in the Irish speaking districts unless the bilingual system is adopted. I want that fact to be thoroughly realised by the Committee, and to enable the Committee to fully appreciate it, perhaps it will allow me to quote a few passages from the report of Mr. Leggard, one of Her Majesty's Chief Inspectors of Schools in Wales. I believe efforts have been made to teach the Welsh children through the medium of English, but it has been fully recognised of late that that system was a hopeless failure, and now I believe that the bilingual system is universally adopted in the Principality. What does Mr. Leggard say in his report for 1898?

"No system can really flourish unless it is supported by national sentiment and unless it has won the affections of the people. In the case of Wales, it is clear, I think, that education has got a real hold of the popular sympathies, just as it has in the northern part of Great Britain.

"It would be well to bear in mind that in some of the Welsh-speaking districts the children never hear a word of English outside the schools, and so the English language is something quite apart from their daily life and interests, and is merely a vehicle for school lessons. . . . Should it not be frankly recognised that English is a foreign language, and that it should be taught by the best methods of teaching foreign languages? Welsh children should not merely learn bookish English, but they should be encouraged from the infants' school upwards to talk in the foreign tongue about things that interest them—their homes, their games, their pet animals; and when a vocabulary is acquired simple rules of grammar will gradually be deduced, and the children will be trained in due course by speaking correctly to write correctly. Instruction in English on the lines I have indicated should help Welsh children to appreciate better their own mother tongue. . . .

"For Welsh-speaking districts such explanatory instruction (on other subjects beside reading) should in the earlier years of school life be to a great extent given in the vernacular, and the children will thus be able to assimilate what they hear. This they cannot do while they are puzzled by the unfamiliar sounds of an unknown tongue."

Mr. L. J. Roberts, one of Mr. Leggard's colleagues, in his report for the same year, remarks—

"The use of bilingual reading-books systematically throughout a school helps to do away with the difficulties of the Welsh child. He gains self-confidence, he sees delicate varieties of meaning which he could not otherwise grasp, his taste for reading in both languages is developed, and the mere practice of comparing the idioms of two languages is itself a valuable mental exercise."

Mr. Jones, another colleague of Mr. Leggard, says in his report—

"The future of Welsh education is very promising, and the Welsh people have now placed within their reach educational advantages which were undreamt of at the beginning of the century."

Can that be said of Ireland? I ask again: Can that be said of Ireland? and if not, why not? That is the question.

I now come to a report by Mr. Darlington, another Welsh school inspector. Mr. Darlington says—

"I feel strongly that reading as at present taught is not doing as much as it might do in the direction of stimulating the general intelligence of the scholars. The fact that in teaching a Welsh child to read English we are really teaching him the use of a foreign language is at present not sufficiently taken into account, and one feels too often that a mechanical fluency in reading English is accompanied by the vaguest possible notion of the sense of the passage read. The use of bilingual readers has done much to make the reading lesson a more intelligent exercise. Still more satisfactory results are obtained in schools where the practice of oral translations forms a regular part of the reading lesson."

These reports, from which I have given only a few extracts, are taken from the general report of Mr. Leggard, the Chief Inspector. Mr. Leggard concludes his enlightened and interesting report in these words—

"I will only say in conclusion that the state of elementary education in Wales is full of encouragement, provided those concerned with it do not rest contented with their achievements in the past, but endeavour to make steady and united progress in the future."

I am sure hon. Members will agree with me that there should be no further necessity for me to argue the point as to the advantages of the bilingual system where English is not the home language. I have quoted from the reports of several Welsh school inspectors in support of my case, and now I shall quote from a solitary Irish Commissioner — Dr. Starkie, who stands alone, or almost alone, in the wilderness of prejudice, ignorance, and antediluvianism which surrounds the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland. Dr. Starkie, in a speech last February, used these words—

"The National Board had made a disastrous blunder in thrusting on a Gaelic-speaking race a system of education produced after a foreign model and utterly alien to their sympathies and antecedents. The attempt was unsound (he continued), both philosophically and practically. The Board were guilty of narrow pedantry in neglecting as worthless the whole spiritual life of the pupil, and the multitude of associations, imaginations, and sentiments that formed the content of his consciousness. To this unhappy blunder may be attributed the want of initiative and independence, and distaste of knowledge, which so hamper the industrial development of Ireland—qualities so alien to the quick sympathies and alert intelligence which are the most salient characteristics of our race."

It is quite refreshing to come across an Irish official with such broad, enlightened, and patriotic views. As far as I know, there is only one Nationalist on this educational board — Archbishop Walsh, and not only is he a Nationalist but he is a man of great culture, and he is a strong advocate for the bilingual system. Who are the other Commissioners? The present members are the following—

	Nominated in
Lord Morris	1868
E. G. Dease, D.L.	1880
W. L. Newell, LL.D., C.B., J.P.	1886
J. Malcolm Inglis, J.P. ...	1887
Sir Percy R. Grace, Bart., D.L.	1888
James Morell	1888
G. F. Fitzgerald, F.T.C.D., F.R.S.	1888
Sir H. Bellingham, Bart., D.L.	1890
Right Hon. Christopher Palles, Lord Chief Baron	1890
Rev. Henry Evans, D.D. ...	1890
Sir R. Blennerhassett, Bart., D.L.	1891
Judge Shaw	1891
Rev. Hamilton B. Wilson. D.D.	1892
Archbishop Walsh, D.D. ...	1895
Stanley Harrington, J.P. ...	1895
W. R. J. Molloy, J.P.	1895
Edward Dowden, LL.D., D.C.L.	1896
Rev. J. H. Bernard, D.D., F.T.C.D.	1897
Right Rev. Mervyn Archdall, D.D.	1897
W. J. M. Starkie (Resident Commissioner)	1899

In that list of twenty gentlemen, I venture to say that with the exception of Dr. Walsh there is not a man amongst them who is not a Unionist. They are men who have a horror of every Nationalist sentiment, who are steeped to the lips in bigotry, prejudice, and intolerance, men who see in this Gallic League movement, the Scarlet Lady of Rome or a Republican Ireland. These are the gentlemen the Government of this country entrust the education of the Catholic and Nationalist people of Ireland to! Is it any wonder that the Irish people hate your modes of governing their country?

Well, Sir, school inspectors have strongly recommended the use of bilingual systems in several parts of

Ireland. The Bishops of Ireland have recommended it. Cardinal Logue, the head of the Irish Episcopacy, is a missionary in the work. Over 200 school managers—representing over a thousand schools—Protestants as well as Catholics, have petitioned the fossils in favour of it. Public bodies, such as poor law guardians, county councils, district councils galore, have passed resolutions in favour of it. In fact, Sir, practically the whole of Ireland is most earnestly in favour of the bilingual system; and I suppose it is because they are in favour of it that the Commissioners are against it. Such is the way we are governed in Ireland.

I am now, Sir, going to tell the Committee what, I suppose, I should have told it in the beginning of my observations: that we have still in Ireland a large number of people who speak only the Irish language, and still a larger number who speak both languages—Irish and English. Along the coast from Donegal, round west to Waterford, there are at least 30 per cent. of the people speaking the Gaelic tongue. I hold in my hand a table showing the population in 1891—the last census—of eleven counties, Clare, Cork, Donegal, Galway, Kerry, Limerick, Mayo, Roscommon, Sligo, Tipperary, and Waterford. The total population in these eleven counties in 1891 was 2,004,193, or nearly half the population of the whole of Ireland. The number of Irish speakers as given in the census list was 638,821, so that the percentage of persons speaking Irish in 1891 was 32. The total number of children in the primary schools at that time was 308,269, and 32 per cent. of that number would give 95,734 children as speaking the Irish language in 1891. That is under the estimate, because a great many of them will not admit that they speak Irish. In many of these counties Irish is the home language—that is, the children never hear a word of English spoken except while they are in school. I know this to be a fact, for throughout the whole of Connemara, my own constituency, the people invariably talk to each other in Irish. Is it not monstrous to think that these children are handicapped in life by this stupid unilingual system, which not only leaves the children uneducated, but positively works mental and moral destruction upon them? I daresay the superior Englishman will only see another sentimental Irish grievance in this. Be it so. Your attitude will only add another link to that long chain that binds, not England and Ireland in loving brotherhood, but adds a link to that chain that binds the people of Ireland and the people of the Irish race in a bond of hatred and ill-will to your infernal system and methods of governing our country.

The Chief Secretary is reported to have stated in this House, four years ago—

> "He could not see that it was desirable to artificially stimulate the study of Irish. If there was a national desire to do so, he would not stand in the way of it. There were, it is true, districts in Ireland where the national language was the language of the people, and where that was the case it was probably true that the best way to teach the children was to teach them in the language that they naturally spoke."

These were his words, and I thank the Chief Secretary for having uttered them. I hope he will see the necessity of pushing these sentiments into effect. What has he done to satisfy the national demand? Does he want further evidence before he is satisfied that there is a national demand? The Irish Members to a man support this claim. But of course they do not count. Does Cardinal Logue count? Do the Bishops of Ireland count? What of the 200 managers that memoralised the Commissioners? Do they not count? What of the public bodies? Do they count? I will give the right hon. Gentleman something that may perhaps count—that certainly should count. I have here a resolution from the Central Executive of the National Teachers' Association, and with the permission of the House I will read it—

> "That as practical educationists we heartily endorse the statement made by Dr. Starkie, the Resident Commissioner of National Education, in his speech at Glasnevin on the 19th February last, that the National Board was guilty of a disastrous blunder in thrusting upon a Gaelic-speaking race a system of education produced after a foreign model and utterly alien to their sympathies and antecedents. In order, therefore, that tardy justice might be done to tens of thousands of children in the Irish-speaking districts, we hereby demand that in all places where Irish is the home language pupils shall be taught to read and write Irish from their first entrance into school," etc.

I will quote one other authority. At the National Teachers' Congress, recently held,

the following resolution was unanimously passed—

"That we cordially recommend all National teachers to use their opportunities on behalf of the preservation of the Irish language. Being an important aid to a proper elementary education throughout the country, and its use in instruction being recommended to teachers by the Commissioners of National Education, we deeply regret the want of provision for the instruction of teachers, and request the Commissioners and the managers of the training colleges to have professors of Irish in those colleges. That while not desiring to reduce the extent of the programme for a certificate of competency to teach Irish, we believe that in the matter of text-books the programme could be considerably improved. We are also strongly of opinion that the programme for pupils should be so altered as to extend over five years, be more suitably graduated, and be freed as much as possible from unpractical matter. That in all places where Irish is the home language, the pupils shall be taught to read and write Irish from their first entrance into the school," etc.

I shall trouble the Committee with one more quotation. Father O'Leary, the parish priest of Castlelyons, co. Cork, writing in the *Freeman's Journal* of last Tuesday, in reply to Lord Russell of Killowen, who unfortunately is one of the very few educated Irishmen who do not see eye to eye with us in this matter. Father O'Leary puts the case admirably, and I shall only quote a few lines from his argument proving the evil results from the unilingual system. Father O'Leary says—

"I will ask his Lordship to accompany me in spirit while we pay a visit to a 'National School' situated in one of the Irish-speaking districts of this country. There stands the teacher. He never speaks a single word of Irish to any of his pupils. Look at the faces of the children, especially those whose home speech is Irish unmixed. They are like French children who never spoke a word of English, placed in an English school, and forbidden to speak a single word of French. There is a fixed, dull, closed-up expression on their faces. Examine them in their lessons. They repeat syllables of words, but you can see at once that the words are not for them the expression of ideas. Ask the meaning of a word. They repeat the syllables of the meaning exactly as given at the head of the lesson, but for them the meaning has no meaning. Ask for the sense of a sentence. The answer is dead silence. A parrot is not capable of giving the sense of phrases which he utters. Follow those children home. Hear them plunge into their native element. The dull, fixed expression disappears from the face at once. All the varying beams of keen intelligence shine forth at every word and at every turn of expression. The following day they put on again the mask of dulness."

If the right hon. Gentleman, and if this House is not satisfied with the volume of public and enlightened opinion which I have referred to, upon the necessity and urgency of introducing a bilingual system in certain districts in Ireland, the right hon. Gentleman and this House will never be satisfied with any further evidence on the matter, unless, indeed, they got some outward and visible sign of the indignation and disgust that will fill the breasts of Irishmen if their reasonable and moderate claim is not soon recognised. But I do not despair that this House here to-day will mark its appreciation of our just claim in this language question. The speech of one moment from those benches opposite would be worth more than all our speeches put together. I hope we shall have some speeches from those benches in our favour to-day. I would appeal to the Committee to listen to us for once while we make our most moderate claim. We have heard a good deal in the last few years of your having robbed us of two and a half millions a year for many years. That may have been to your material advantage. But in robbing us of our native language you have robbed us of that which has not enriched you, but has made us poor indeed. In conclusion, I say, give us back our language. Revise your educational systems in Ireland, so that our children, in those Irish speaking districts that I have referred to, shall be enabled, as Welsh children are enabled, to acquire a proper knowledge of English, which is now more necessary than ever for their equipment in the battle of life. Do something genuine and substantial to promote and encourage the revival of our Gaelic tongue in our primers and intermediate schools. It will cost you little or nothing to do so. And if you now respond to the universal and passionate demand of the Irish people and of the Irish race, although you will be doing but simple justice, you will be going a long way towards making reparation for the countless wrongs your country has inflicted upon Ireland. Sir, I move to reduce the Vote.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): I desire to second the motion which has been made by my hon. friend in the admirable speech which he has just delivered. I confess that I regret that there is such a scanty attendance in the

House, because it is impossible to conceive a subject which more deeply interests the people of Ireland than the one which is now under discussion. Sir, Ireland takes a keen interest in this question, because Ireland believes that the whole future of the Irish race may be said to be largely bound up with this question. In the whole history of English misgovernment in Ireland I believe there is no such glaring instance as this of flagrant disregard of the unanimous public opinion of the country and of obstinate stupidity in a disastrous course. This matter concerns the people of Ireland vitally, because it concerns the education of the great mass of the poorer children in Ireland—that is, those who will be the future Irish nation. Now, Sir, allow me, without repeating any of the arguments used by my hon. friend in moving this motion, to state in my own words as concisely as I can what the case is we desire to present to the House. Roughly speaking, it is estimated that there are some 700,000 Irish-speaking people in Ireland, and it is estimated that there are some 70,000 Irish children attending the National schools who do not know one single syllable of English. Now, Sir, for these 70,000 children there is no provision whatever.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. G. W. BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): Do I understand the hon. Gentleman to say that there are 70,000 children in Ireland at the present time who are unable to speak a word of English?

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I say it is estimated that there are 70,000 children attending these National schools—perhaps I put it a little too far in saying that they do not know a syllable of English—who know little or no English, and whose home language is Irish.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: According to the census of 1891 the total number of Irish-speaking persons in Ireland was only 31,121.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I still maintain that the figures I have given to the Committee are correct. But, after all, it is a question of degree; and if the right hon. Gentleman supposes that his figures are right and the figures supplied to me are wrong, how far will that bring him in refusing? Because if it is only a question of 36,000 children, or of 30,000 children, or of 20,000 children, still the case would be a monstrous one if no provision whatever is to be made for the proper teaching of these children. But it is not merely that there is no special provision whatever for the teaching of these children, whose home language is Irish, but there is no provision whatever in other districts, where Irish is not so much spoken, to enable Irish to be taught as a remunerated subject in school hours. The case which we make is this: that in all places—I speak not now of children who cannot speak a word of English—but in all cases, in all districts where the home language is Irish, the children from those homes going into the National schools should be taught to read and write their own language, and should be taught English through the medium of their own language; and in the second place that Irish ought to be taught in all schools of Ireland as a remunerated subject in school hours wherever the circumstances of the school, in the opinion of the managers, warranted it. That is the demand, stated as concisely as I think it is possible to state it. Let me ask now who makes the demand. Sir, I believe it would be impossible to find a demand made with more complete unanimity from the people of Ireland than this one. In the first place, let me point out that the demand has been formally brought before the Board of National Education in Ireland on a memorial from the managers of 1,200 National schools in the Irish-speaking districts. It is supported, as my hon. friend has mentioned, by the declarations of the Irish bishops. I may be allowed to repeat what the Irish bishops have said. This is the unanimous resolution passed by the Catholic bishops of Ireland—

> "We strongly recommend that in the primary schools in all Irish-speaking districts the instruction should be bilingual, English being taught through the medium of Irish. We also regard it as most desirable in the primary schools of other districts that the Irish language should be taught to the children in the third and the higher classes wherever the managers of the schools deem it advisable, and the parents make no objection."

And in addition to the unanimous declaration of all the Catholic bishops in Ireland, there are members of the Protestant Episcopacy who take the same

view; and some of them—one of whom has recently passed away (I mean the late Dr. Greaves)—take a most passionate interest in this question. Almost all the public-elected boards in Ireland have made similar expressions. Corporations, county councils, district councils, town commissions, urban and district councils, who have spoken—and many of them have spoken on the question—have given expression to the same view. There is also the unanimous declaration laid before the Board of National Education from the clerical managers of the schools in the province of Connaught, which is the province chiefly concerned in this demand. Then there is the declaration which has been alluded to by my hon. friend, made by the executive of the National Teachers' Association—that is to say, the men who are engaged in the practical work of teaching in the schools, and who, so far from raising any objection, desire that this concesion should be made, and that Irish should be taught in their schools. The same demand comes from the National Teachers' Congress, held the other day in the city of Derry. The Irish Members of Parliament are unanimous in supporting this demand. I do not know whether there is any individual Irish Member of Parliament who has any objection to Irish being taught in the National schools, but I have never heard of one; certainly it is safe to say that the overwhelming majority of Irish Members of all parties in this House take the same view. Perhaps the most remarkable testimony that this view is a sound one has come from the ranks of the National Board itself. Dr. Starkie has been alluded to, and my hon. friend has quoted some of his words. I am not going back upon them now, although perhaps I may have again to allude to them before I conclude; but I would point out that this demand comes from the most responsible Commissioner of the Board of National Education in Ireland, backing up the unanimous request from every public body and every representative of public opinion in Ireland. And, Sir, I can quote the Chief Secretary as a friend to this demand. My hon. friend quoted a declaration which the Chief Secretary made some years ago; but this very session the right hon. Gentleman, if I am not mistaken, in answer to a question across the floor of the House, made a most friendly declaration. He did not perhaps go the extreme length that some advocates of the Gaelic revival in Ireland go, but he made a most sympathetic answer, because he said first he fully believed that where Irish was the language of the children their education could be more fully carried out through the medium of their own language.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: Hear, hear!

MR. JOHN REDMOND: That, no doubt, refers to children who come from Irish-speaking homes. In the second place, the Chief Secretary went on to say—

> "While I could not undertake to artificially stimulate the study of Irish, yet if there is a widespread demand for its teaching I would not stand in the way."

Therefore, Sir, I think I am justified in quoting the right hon. Gentleman himself as a friend to the demand which is now made. Now, Sir, I think I have said enough to show that it would be quite impossible to conceive a demand more influentially put forward and more universally supported in Ireland than this demand which we put forward to-day. It is supported by every class of the population; it is supported by the hierarchy and the clergy of not one, but, I believe, of all denominations in Ireland. It is supported by the managers of the schools, by the teachers of the schools, by the elected representatives of the people, whether in this House or in the public boards, throughout the country, and I think I am justified, therefore, in my assertion that no more influential demand was ever made in this House. Having stated what the demand is, and why we are making it, let me consider whether the demand is in itself reasonable, moderate, and based upon precedent, and whether it is not really one which, from an Irish point of view, should be considered in the general interest of the country. Is it reasonable? The present system of teaching in the Irish-speaking districts has been proved by bitter experience to be useless, and that is the explanation of the alarming proportion of illiterates which obtains in many districts of Ireland. The whole experience of this attempt to teach English through the medium of English to children who come from Irish-speaking homes has been to show that these children, after they leave school,

rapidly lapse into illiteracy. All experience proves that the bilingual system of education for such districts is the best. I am loth to trouble the House, but I would like to read one or two sentences from a very weighty memorial which has been presented to the National Board of Education from the managers of 1,200 schools. That memorial has been treated with the scantiest courtesy, and so far as I can see has received no answer at all. These gentlemen, Protestant and Catholic alike included in the list of the managers of 1,200 schools, say—

"The children of these districts come from Irish-speaking homes, where all the familiar converse of life, and, still more, all the higher and more spiritual ideas, are habitually expressed by their parents and elders in Irish. The first foundations, and the most important part of the mental development of the children are thus naturally made in the Irish language. We consider it to be a radical error, on the entrance of the children into school, to completely ignore the natural foundations thus laid, and to commence *de novo* their education in an unfamiliar language. To ignore the utility of Irish in teaching these children from the outset, is, in our opinion, a primary blunder for many reasons. It is in itself an unnatural and irrational method of education. It deliberately puts on one side all that the children may have learned not alone of the vocabulary of common life, but of the finer shades of thought and feeling which are eminently characteristic of the Irish language. It also puts aside the spiritual traditions of the Irish language, leaving their place to be supplied by what should only supplement them, and could be made to supplement them, in Irish as well as, or better than, in English—namely, direct memorised instructions. Experience has shown that the native traditional taste for poetry and other forms of literature and for music is taken away from the people along with their native language. A still more grievous evil is that their respect for home, parents, national traditions, and the past of their own people is undermined by the present system, and thus the foundations of the civic virtues of self-respect and self-reliance, so conducive to the welfare of a people, are shaken from the commencement. It often happens under the present system that after a number of years at school young people practically lapse into illiteracy, and forget how to read and write simple English. Even of those who may seem to have profited more a large number have little better than a mechanical proficiency, and from the standpoint of material advancement are hardly to be distinguished from the class of illiterates. We believe that these defects in education will be removed by teaching the children to read and write, and utilise to its fullest capacity the language in common use among the grown people in these districts. This belief is not grounded solely on *a priori* reasons, but is fully borne out by the experiences of primary education in Great Britain, where for some years the Welsh language has been employed in education in the way in which we seek to have Irish employed."

I ought, perhaps, to apologise for reading so lengthy an extract, but the sound reasonable argument contained in it deserves the serious attention of all interested in the education of the young in Ireland. For my part I do not know what is the answer to it. Dr. Starkie, Resident Commissioner of National Education, has spoken much to the same effect. He says—

"The cause is not far to seek why the National system has not had the full measure of success which its friends would desire for it. From the first its besetting sin has been centralisation. From the centre in Dublin the National Board, disregarding all differences of race and creed and local prejudices, has imposed on all parts of the country a rigid programme, perhaps ideally satisfactory, but in many cases ludicrously ill adapted to the needs of the backward districts of Ireland, and to the capacities of the pupils. As an illustration of my meaning I may refer to the treatment accorded to what seventy years ago was really the national tongue. Without committing myself to the extravagances of some of the enthusiasts of the Gaelic League, I fancy few practical educationalists will deny that the National Board were guilty of a disastrous blunder in thrusting upon a Gaelic-speaking race a system of education produced after a foreign model and utterly alien to their sympathies and antecedents. Such an attempt was unsound, both philosophically and practically. Neglecting the principle of continuity which pervades all human things, it disregarded the home training and associations of the children, and thus rending in twain the nascent intelligence, rendered all real development impossible. True education is a refining and developing of the whole intellectual life and character, and I think there can be little doubt that the Board were guilty of narrow pedantry in neglecting as worthless the whole previous spiritual life of the pupil, and the multitude of associations, imaginations, and sentiments that formed the content of his consciousness. The consequences of such a system are inevitable. To this unhappy blunder may be attributed the want of initiative and independence, and distaste of knowledge, which so hampers the industrial development of Ireland—qualities so alien to the quick sympathies and alert intelligence which are the most salient characteristics of our race."

I saw yesterday in *The Times* a most interesting letter from Mr. Edmund Gosse, in which he speaks of the Irish language in this way—

"Irish has been in literary use for centuries, which has held the thoughts of generations of great men, which has preserved a poetry of singular mystery and tenderness. Whether we read Irish or not—for my part I am with the Saxon majority—that tongue has been for centuries an unseen but priceless appanage of

British literature. The language of Ireland has been blossoming there unseen, like a hidden garden of roses, and, whenever the wind has blown from the West, our English poetry has felt the vague perfume of it."

It is interesting to know that even the most vehement opponents of the study of Irish, such as Dr. Atkinson and others like him, still admit that children coming from where Irish is the familiar language ought to be taught English through the medium of Irish. Dr. Atkinson went before the Commission as the great opponent of the Gaelic revival, and yet he used these words—

"These children should be taught Irish, and they would learn it with very great advantage because they speak it from their childhood . . . If they spoke it, then it would be right to teach them in their own mother tongue. It is wrong to children not to teach them in their mother tongue . . . If they know Irish better than English coming into the school, let their education be Irish. If the child thinks in the Irish language, let him be taught in the Irish language."

Surely I have said enough to show that the demand which is made is in itself a reasonable one, and that it has the support of the most eminent educational authorities in Ireland. Let me ask for a moment whether the demand is without precedent. We are not asking for anything strange, extravagant, or unheard of. As a matter of fact, we are asking for that which is to-day possessed by Wales, and not more than is possessed by the Highlands of Scotland. I want to know by what constitutional theory can this demand, put forward by practically every class and creed in Ireland, and proved to be reasonable in the opinion of skilled educationalists, is to be refused, and why an irresponsible body of men nominated by the Crown, or a majority of them, is to insist in excluding this Irish language from our schools in spite of the universal desire of the people of Ireland? What we ask for to-day is less than exists in Wales. In the Welsh Code for 1900, it is set forth that the Welsh language is one of the subjects which may be taken up if it suits the circumstances of the schools, and the managers approve. Then, in the standard of examinations on elementary subjects there is dictation from Cymric reading-books. In Welsh translations from English, the written examination may be in both English and Welsh, and there is history reading both in Welsh and English. Further, I find that English is to be taught bilingually. Special provision is also made for the training of the teachers in Welsh, and in their examinations they are obliged to be able to read Welsh and recite Welsh poetry. Under the head of history, the teachers must show a knowledge not only of English history, but of the history of Wales prior to the union with England; and further, submit to a test of their knowledge of the history of Wales generally. I want to know why all this should be given to Wales and denied to Ireland. All that we ask is that the bilingual system of teaching should be set up in Irish-speaking districts where the children come from Irish-speaking homes, and that in other districts Irish may be one of the remunerated subjects taught, if the managers so desire it, in the school hours. The Scotch Code makes almost precisely the same provision. In the Gaelic-speaking districts, that is, in the counties of Inverness, Argyll, Ross and Cromarty, and Sutherland, an extra pupil-teacher is allowed in respect of bilingual teaching, and provision is made also for the teaching of Gaelic in the training colleges. It seems to me that a demand put forward as this has been, and supported by all classes of the people of Ireland, proves to be reasonable and based on the precedents of Scotland and Wales, and that the contemptuous rejection of that demand by this nominated, irresponsible, and intensely anti-national Board is a most monstrous thing, which the House of Commons ought not to tolerate for one instant. There is another aspect of the question which appeals to us Irishmen, however it may appeal to English Members. At this moment—and there is no use of the Chief Secretary underrating the feeling of the Irish—an intense and passionate movement exists in favour of saving the remnants of the Irish tongue for the Irish people of the future. It is natural, because to all Irishmen, whatever their class, or creed, or politics, who are proud of their country, of its history, of its traditions, when in the old times, almost alone among Western nations, Ireland held aloft the lamp of learning and cherished the truths of religion, this neglect of the ancient tongue of their forefathers must seem an unpardonable wrong; and I say in a special way to

all those who love the songs and stories and folk lore of Ireland, to all those—

> "Who love a nation's legends,
> Love the ballads of a people,
> That, like voices from afar off,
> Speak in tones so plain and childlike,
> Scarcely can the ear distinguish
> Whether they are sung or spoken"—

to all such who treasure poetry, the romance and the music of their country, as things which give individuality and character to their race, and almost a soul to their nation—to all such men, this wanton attempt to destroy the Irish tongue must seem an outrage and a sacrilege. The injury to Ireland is a material and a moral one at the same time. This system undoubtedly dwarfs the intellects and stunts the minds of the young children of Ireland, on whom will depend the future well-being and prosperity of the country. It deprives them of all knowledge of a glorious past, and shuts them out from the slightest glimpse of the poetic and romantic literature, and it places upon them the humiliating badge of inferiority. This authority in Ireland must not be permitted to do this wrong, and we are here to appeal to every independent Member of the House to aid in preventing this wrong being perpetrated in future. We appeal in an especial way to those kinsmen of ours of the Celtic race who are here from Scotland and Wales. We ask them to assist us in putting an end to this wrong, and in helping us to do for our country what they have succeeded in doing for their own—to protect the ancient tongue of our forefathers, in which is enshrined so much of the glorious heritage that has come down through the centuries to Ireland from her sages, her poets, her scholars, and her statesmen.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £787,403, be granted for the said Service." — (*Mr. O'Malley.*)

*MR. RENTOUL (Down, E.): This is in no sense, in my opinion, a political question, but one which we may discuss quite freely, although we may take different views upon the subject; and I must say that with the views which have been expressed upon the opposite side of the House I disagree in every particular. That being so, I desire to put before the Committee the reasons which have led me to the conclusion at which I have arrived. The hon. Gentleman who moved this motion said everything that could possibly be said in its favour from that side of the House, and, although the seconder of the motion made an eloquent and most powerful speech, he did not add much, if anything, to the arguments already urged by the hon. Gentleman whom he supported. The mover of the motion made an attack on the books used in the schools of Ireland, and in that respect I entirely disagree with him. I have studied those books as a boy, and have since compared them with the books used in English schools, and I have come to the deliberate conclusion that there are no books anywhere which are better than those used by the National School Board of Ireland. There are several of the Irish school books which could not possibly be beaten for the purposes for which they are designed. But the question before the Committee is the question of the Irish language, and I only refer in passing to the books, and I say that I have not been able to agree with the observations with regard to them made by the hon. Gentleman. Coming to the Irish language itself, I think the bilingual system is an excellent one, and to learn two languages perfectly is far better than to learn half a dozen imperfectly. For a man to be able to speak two languages is a very great advantage; it broadens his mind, and enables him to enlarge his knowledge and acquire other subjects. But are two languages, properly learned, possible for the poor people of any country? Are there any countries where the working classes learn two languages? [A VOICE from the Irish benches: Yes—Wales.] In many parts of Wales it is true that Welsh is spoken as the mother tongue, and the people as they grow up acquire English; but take France or Germany, or any other Continental country. Are the poor people of those countries able to speak two languages? Does such a thing exist anywhere?

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): Yes, in half a dozen places.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): What about Antwerp?

*MR. RENTOUL: I should certainly like to see that assertion proved, and Antwerp does not prove it. Those

who have lived among Continental nations will admit they have never come across anything of the sort. You may go through the city of Paris, or Berlin, or other Continental cities from end to end before you find two mechanics who have really learned more than one language, and it is not for us in this House to make statements which are not borne out by the facts. [Interruption from the Irish benches.] Hon. Gentlemen will have an opportunity to prove the statement they make; but surely it is only fair that a man should be allowed to express his opinions with regard to the teaching of a language, even if they do not coincide with those of the hon. Gentleman opposite. I do not believe it is possible for the working people of any country to learn two languages, and I have not come across any who have. They have neither the time nor the inclination. But supposing it were possible for two languages to be taught, would it be wise for the Irish people to make the ancient language of their country the second one? Do the Irish people who send their children to expensive schools in Ireland make the Irish language one of the languages to be taught to their children? They have them taught French or German, but do they have them taught the Irish language? And is it wise to try to encourage the lower classes in a study of a language which the higher classes themselves have not learned and do not teach their children? If it were possible to learn any number of languages one would be very glad to have Irish taught as one of them; but the time for learning spoken languages is limited, and the number of languages one can learn is limited, and human intellect is limited, everywhere except among Irish Nationalists. Now, speaking of this particular language, we know that men and women of the better classes do not have their children taught Irish [Cries of "Oh, oh!"] I ask what member of the Irish party in this House is having his children taught Irish? I am very far from making an attack upon the Irish language. The hon. Member for East Mayo alluded to a man who spoke of Irish literature as disgusting and abominable. That is certainly the last charge I would make—for one reason, that I am not sufficiently familiar with Irish literature to make such an attack—nor do I think that any good is done by making an attack of that sort, especially as all Celtic scholars admit that the ancient Irish literature is much richer and more beautiful than the literature of any of the other five Celtic languages. We know that there are historical documents in the Irish language of the highest possible order, and poems — epic, lyric, and didactic—of unrivalled beauty and marvellous pathos; but there is a difference between teaching a language to a whole people and preserving the ancient documents of that language. Is anyone taught in Italy to speak the Latin which was spoken in ancient Rome? Yet it is not as a dead language, but as a living one, that hon. Gentlemen wish Irish to be taught. The mover of the motion spoke, in reference to the teaching of the Irish language, of its value. If he refers to its value to philologists, no one disagrees with him; but if he refers to its practical value, then I assert that it has hardly any value. It seems to me that the practical value of a language depends entirely upon the number of people who speak it.

MR. DILLON: Then Chinese should be the most valuable language in the world.

*MR. RENTOUL: I am glad to be able to answer the hon. Gentleman upon that point. Only some two years ago a movement was started by many leading men in London to try and get Chinese taught even in preference to French or German, because of its greater commmercial value. Of course, if a language is only to be learned for mere sentimental reasons, and not for reasons of travel, trade, or other practical purposes, we can well understand that a language which is spoken at the top of a mountain in Russia by about 150 people altogether would be the most valuable of languages, because it is one of the rarest and most peculiar. Speaking of European languages, would any man wish his children to be taught Portuguese in preference to French or Italian or Spanish? And yet Portuguese is an excellent language. Is not the feeling of all men who have to do with the study of modern languages to go in this direction when they say that the more a language is what they call a world speech or *umgangsprache* language, the more is that language one that ought to be learned? Discussion is often carried on as to whether German or French is the more valuable language—that is,

which affects the larger number of people? If a man is to have only one language, I think it is clear to everyone that the most valuable language he can have is English, and next to that is French, because French will serve you in a greater number of the countries of the world than any other language except English. Except for sentimental reasons it would be absolutely valueless to teach the Celtic language in Ireland. The value of a language depends not merely on the use you can make of it not in your own country, but of the use you can make of it when you leave your own country. [Laughter.] I must say that I fail entirely to see what is in the minds of hon. Members. If I were going to travel I would certainly very much prefer that my own language was English rather than Portuguese. Portuguese may be a better language from the grammarian's point of view than English, but it would not serve me one-twentieth as much as English would do. If a language is to serve the purpose for which it was intended—namely, that men may convey their ideas to the men whom they meet—necessarily, the greater the number of people who speak a language the more the value of that language to men who are going about the world and doing the business of the world. The mover of the motion spoke of the value of the Irish language. But what real value has it? If he wants the people of Ireland to learn a Continental language he will recollect how much they would be handicapped from the entire absence of books for teaching French, German, or Italian, or any Continental language through the medium of the Irish language. It has been argued—I do not know whether it was referred to in this debate—as one strong reason in favour of teaching the Celtic language that the Jews, who are passionately attached to their own religion and nationality, teach the Hebrew language as well as the language of the country in which they are placed. That is easily explained. They never teach colloquial or cursive Hebraic. They teach the language of their prayers and of ecclesiastical documents, but they do not teach their children colloquial Hebrew as they teach them French or German. So that if any argument is to be drawn from what the Jews do, it would prove that the Irish people should teach their children Latin, that being the language of the prayers and ecclesiastical documents of the Church of the large majority of the people of Ireland. The first question to settle is, what is the purpose for which you desire the second language? Is it for sentiment or for practical purposes? If it is for sentiment, can Ireland in her present commercial and financial position afford to sacrifice practical utility to sentiment? If the second language is wanted for practical purposes, then comes the question, what do other nations do which have an ancient language still lingering among a few of the lower orders of the people and yet have as the real language of the people some imported tongue? What do practical and prosperous peoples do in such circumstances? Take the case of the Belgians. Their ancient language is Flemish. They do not teach French through Flemish, they do not teach Flemish at the expense of French. I had an opportunity, when in Belgium not long ago, of hearing a number of classes examined, and I was told that there is a desire there on the part of educationists to relegate the Flemish language to the category of ancient history, and to make the French language the speech to be used in the country. We know that the Belgians are, perhaps, the most practical people in the whole of Europe. We are told that there are no people so successful according to their numbers, or who make so good a use of life's opportunities generally. That is the experience of highly practical men in connection with an extremely energetic people, and the example of the Belgians is very much in point when Irishmen are discussing this question not from a political but from a purely practical point of view, as showing what is best for the country in its practical interests. If Irish were spoken as much as English in America, Australia, and other countries where Irishmen go, I should certainly think then there was something to be said for making Irish the language of the country. I do not suppose Irish is a worse language from any point of view, but I look at this question from the practical side, and we cannot get over the fact that Irish is not spoken elsewhere. A good deal has been said about the advantage of teaching English as far as possible through Irish to the pupils in Irish schools. I may be in an extreme minority in this matter—I fancy that the Chief Secretary is probably against me—but

that would not be my aim. If I were to-morrow going to learn a foreign language I should prefer to be taught that language through itself, and to make what effort I could to understand it. I believe I would arrive at a knowledge of that language quicker in that way. The hon. Member for South Donegal seems to be highly amused by that statement, but after all, a great many Members of the House have done exactly what I have said. Numerous Members of the House have gone to foreign countries without knowing the language at all. They did not go to lodge with an English family to learn French, or German because they were English-speaking people. No; they plunged into a foreign house altogether, and picked up the language as well as they could, that being the quickest way in which the language could be acquired, so that by only teaching English through Irish in the schools in Ireland you would not adopt the quickest mode of acquiring a knowledge of English. The people of Ireland, as regards their relation to the Irish language, are of three classes: first, those who do not know Irish, which is nine-tenths of the people; second, those who know and speak both English and Irish; and thirdly, some thirty or forty thousand who know only Irish. The first class had better leave Irish alone; the second class had better cultivate the English, and the third class had better learn English by mixing with English-speaking people. The hon. Member who moved the reduction of the Vote made what appeared to me to be a very extraordinary statement. He said that the teaching of the Irish language would bind the Irish abroad more closely to the Irish at home. No doubt he believed that was an argument, but I could not for the life of me see how it could possibly affect that question. For example, the Irish people who are scattered abroad in America and Australia do not know the Irish language. How the teaching of Irish as their mother tongue to the people of Ireland could draw them closer to the Irish people in America who do not know that language, and never desire or try to learn it, I fail entirely to understand. Indeed, it seems to me the very opposite would be the result. As a matter of fact, very few people in Ireland speak Irish alone. Very few indeed are dependent on the Celtic language, and very few of the peasantry are proud that they speak the two languages. The tendency is rather the other way—rather to deny that they know the Irish language than to admit that they do know it. Since so few people speak the Irish language in Ireland would it not be a monstrous thing to fetter the educational energies of the country by trying to revive a language which, if it once became the sole language, would be of the greatest disadvantage to the people of Ireland in their intercourse with other nations? Wales and the Welsh language have been referred to. But in Wales the Welsh language is spoken by the bulk of the people. Almost every Welsh Member addresses his constituents in Welsh. What Irish Member addresses his constituents in Irish? In Wales it is simply the question of keeping alive a living language, which the bulk of the people and nearly all the educated classes can speak and read; but in Ireland it is the question of reviving a language that is practically dead. You might as well try to make Latin the spoken and living language of Italy along with Italian. This idea of reviving the Irish language is an idle dream. Scholars may explore the treasure-houses of its literature, but it never can and never ought to be the language of the whole people. Lord Russell of Killowen is always a useful man to quote on your side, but he is not useful to quote on the other side. In this particular instance, as he is so strongly on my side, I may refer to a statement he made lately which has been published in all the papers. Speaking at a meeting of the Gaelic League he said the attempt to revive the Irish language was foolish from every possible point of view. My hon. friend asked—Is not this demand reasonable? I say, No, it is not. That is the point on which we differ at the very start. There are many demands which the Irish people could make with regard to education with which I might not be able to agree, and yet I would not say they were unreasonable. It does not seem to me to be a demand that will ever be entertained by the Government. It may be discussed on antiquarian grounds in the House, but it is not one that will ever be carried into force. I think it would be a very bad thing for the people of Ireland. The gentleman who opened this debate said that some of us opposed the Irish language because we thought that

if the Irish people were to learn the Irish language Rome would have more power over them. I cannot see how for that reason Rome could have more power over them, seeing that Rome does not know Irish. If Irish were the language of Rome I could understand it. We are not discussing a question of religion, but a question of language on its own merits, no matter how it might bear on any particular cause. It seems to me that one of the best possible tests of sincerity in this matter is to ask, what do hon. Gentlemen opposite do in the case of their own families? What does an educated, enlightened Irish Nationalist do in regard to his own family? That is the test of the whole thing. What has been done in his own education in this matter? The value of a foreign language, especially French, to anyone who has the opportunity of going abroad is immense, and if, though it would not be perhaps practicable, a demand were made by the Irish Nationalists in this House for a further sum in order to encourage the teaching of the French language I would be with them. My hon. and learned friend the Member for South Donegal knows the difficulty which travelling abroad involves. He knows perfectly well that even his immense knowledge of the Celtic language does not serve in the slightest degree. He knows very well how one of his countrymen —shall I say one of his own colleagues?— some time ago wanted to leave his luggage in the cloak-room at a railway station in Italy. This gentleman did not know Italian; he knew simply English and Irish, and a little Latin learned solely in graveyards. He procured the attendance of the station-master by the use of the word *generalissimo*, which he saw signed to a printed notice, and which he took to mean station-master, and he thought that the intelligent station-master would be so fond of the ancient language of his country that he would understand Latin. The traveller on the arrival of the station-master pointed to his luggage and said "Requiescat in pace," and then, pointing to himself, said "Resurgam." By this device ideas were exchanged—the luggage was "to rest in peace" till the traveller "rose again," or, in less poetic words, "came back to claim it." A little Italian would have been very valuable to the traveller, but not Celtic. In that case the Irishman knew the Celtic language, but not the language of the country he visited. I would advise my hon. friends opposite, instead of demanding to foist an impracticable language on the people, to turn their attention to other matters which would do a great deal more for the people. I would remind them that certain districts to which the hon. Member referred, where the Irish language is almost exclusively spoken, are also the poorest in Ireland. Was that in favour of the Irish language or against it? There are a great many districts in Donegal where a great many people speak the language, but does that save them from the poverty that exists in that country? I would feel myself in a far more happy condition if I were able to support hon. Members from Ireland in something that would be for the good of the country, instead of having to take part in a debate year after year on an entirely worthless and foolish demand by gentlemen very few of whom understand or speak five sentences of the language about which they indulge in a long and empty and ludicrous debate.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): I hope hon. Members from Ireland will not object to a Member from another part of the kingdom taking part in the debate for a few moments. The question they have raised is one of very wide and general interest to all parts of the United Kingdom. The question really has absolutely nothing to do with politics. It might have been a political object, or had some political influence and importance sixty or seventy years ago. I believe that Daniel O'Connell used to address large mass meetings in Ireland in the Irish language, and I rather think that the great gathering on the battlefield of Clontarf was to have been so addressed; but we know that now you could not find anybody speaking Irish alone within fifty miles of Clontarf. I do not think any newspapers are published in Irish. [AN HON. MEMBER: There are three newspapers.] Are they daily newspapers? [AN HON. MEMBER: Weekly newspapers.] A weekly newspaper nowadays is apt to be more in the nature of a magazine. There are no daily newspapers, and I have never heard of a vernacular press. [AN HON. MEMBER: Daily papers have columns in Irish.] I am glad to hear that. I was not aware of it. The vernacular press

has, at any rate, never been supposed to be in any way a cause of political agitation. The other remark I want to make is that this is not a question of promoting the Irish language at the expense of the English. I do not understand that that is for a moment intended. The whole argument of the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down has been directed to that point, and is therefore quite irrelevant. I do not think the Chief Secretary supposes that it is intended the teaching of English shall be in any way sacrificed to the teaching of Irish, or that anyone who does not use Irish as the home tongue shall be taught Irish in the schools unless be desires to learn it. It is not suggested that anywhere except in the Irish-speaking districts should the teaching of Irish become a regular part of the school work. Of course, obviously it is for the advantage of the children that they should be able to speak and read and write English. English will open for them a wider career in life than Irish possibly could. I believe that the Welsh Members think—and so far as I know, the Irish Members also think—that English will be positively better taught and understood if taught through Irish. I am not going to argue this question as a matter of national sentiment, or what you would call the sentimental value of language. Personally, I am under the influence of that sentiment. I own that it would seem to me a great misfortune if the ancient Celtic languages were altogether to disappear. I would be sorry to see Irish disappear and should have the same regret were Gaelic or Welsh to vanish. I know that in France there is the same wish not to let the ancient languages die out. There is a desire to keep the Breton and the Basque, and there has been an important revival of Provençal. One of the finest poems France has produced in the last fifty years is a poem, "Mireio," written in the old Provençal language. Therefore there is a great deal to be said for keeping the old language. At the same time I am bound to say with all respect to the distinguished Irish literary man who wrote an interesting letter to *The Times* a few days ago, that I do not think there is much prospect at this time of day of our succeeding in making the ancient Celtic language a vehicle for modern literature. It is a dangerous experiment to try to turn an ancient classical language into a modern one as respects either syntax or vocabulary. The genius of a modern people is too different from that of the ancients. The experiment has been tried in Greece, and modern Greek is not nearly so natural and self-consistent a language since they have endeavoured to make it classical and to bring in the old classical forms of expression. They would have done better to develop a good modern language out of their Romaic. However, I shall not attempt to argue this question upon these sentimental considerations, because although they appeal to some of us very strongly, and although I have the warmest sense of the splendour, the brilliance, and the imaginative power of the ancient Irish literature, an imaginative quality quite unique, and with a wild charm of the Western sea that is all its own; still I think these are arguments that do not appeal to everyone here; and if we have got a strong practical case—as I believe we have—for teaching the old Celtic languages, I would rather argue it on that basis and put considerations which may appeal to persons like the hon. Member who has just sat down. I come to the practical question, and that is this: can anything be done—usefully and practically done—to meet the demands of the Members from Ireland? My excuse for interfering in the debate is that I once had some experience on this subject. I had, thirty-four years ago, the honour of being assistant commissioner of a Royal Commission which was to examine into the endowed grammar schools of Wales. I had to make inquiry there as to the best way of dealing with a large number of Welsh-speaking boys in order to teach them both English and their own language. The testimony was that you teach English better and stimulate the general intelligence more if you use Welsh as well as English in the teaching, and if you teach Welsh as a cultivated language side by side with English. I dare say some of the Welsh Members present can give in their own experience a better illustration of this than I can. However, the Welsh clergymen and schoolmasters whom I consulted were all agreed that the bilingual system not only taught the children English better, but was useful in other respects. It is easy to see why that should be so, because when you take a child and begin to teach it another lan-

guage in addition to its own language the child is obliged to transfer thought from one set of words to another, and in doing so is obliged to get a much more exact idea of the meaning of words, of the genius of a language, and of the nature of the transference of thought than it is possible to get in one language only. That is what we all do in learning Latin. We are obliged to turn our thoughts which we form in English into the form which the same thoughts would take in a different language, and that is one reason why I think no kind of instruction is more valuable than the writing of Latin prose, and the same thing applies in the case of English and Irish. Now I come to the hon. Member for East Down, who asked why we should begin to teach children a language which might be of no use to them. He asked whether there were any countries in Europe where the people speak two languages. Why, it is hard to find a country in Europe in which there are not many people using two languages.

MR. RENTOUL: I said the mechanics and working classes.

MR. BRYCE: There are a great many parts of Europe where the working classes speak two languages. In Belgium a large number of people of the humbler class speak Flemish and French; in Denmark a large part of the peasantry speak German as well as Danish, and in France many of the population speak two languages. In Germany there are large districts where the national language of the population is Slav, but where many also speak German, and it is the same all through the Austrian Empire. In Hungary and Croatia and Dalmatia there is a large bilingual population.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: And in the Italian Alps.

MR. BRYCE: And as my right hon. friend reminds me, it is the same all through the valleys of the western part of the Italian Alps, where both French and Italian are spoken. The same thing is also true in Spain.

MR. RENTOUL: And Yorkshire.

MR. BRYCE: If the hon. Member thinks that the language of Catalonia or Galicia differs no more from classical Castilian than the Yorkshire speech differs from classical English, he is much mistaken. The hon. Member for East Down says he cannot see why two languages should be taught when English is the language to be used. I would remind the hon. Member that the proposal is to teach English through the medium of the native language. The question is whether you should not make the best possible use of their native language. The hon. Member's idea is that you ought to teach English through English, which means that you are to address a child in a language which he does not understand. The truth is that it is a great piece of good fortune in training the minds of children that they should have a language already which they can use to enable them to compare the English, and they will not learn English any more slowly or any less thoroughly if they are taught it through Irish than if that language is neglected. Irish ought to be taught not as a vernacular, but as a literary language. You ought to have reading books in Irish, and the children ought to be accustomed to translate the Irish reading books into English and *vice versa*. In the training colleges in Scotland and in Wales special instruction is given to the teachers who are going to teach in the districts where Welsh or Gaelic is the common tongue to enable them to use Gaelic or Welsh as the vehicle of instruction. This ought to be done in Ireland also. I submit, therefore, that the demand which the Irish Members make is a very reasonable and moderate demand As for Celtic philology, that is rather a matter for higher secondary schools and universities, but I may point out that the larger the number of people to whom instruction is given in Irish, the more prospect is there that in after life some of them will avail themselves of it to study the language scientifically and to make use of the abundant and rich materials which exist for the study of ancient Irish history and Irish literature, materials which have been very sparingly and inadequately used so far. Many years ago I happened to spend a summer vacation in Ireland, where I obtained lessons in Irish—lessons which, to my regret, I have now forgotten—from the son of an Irish peasant who had developed a remarkable talent for philology, and who at that time promised to become—(he died long ago, before that promise could be fulfilled)—one of the

ablest philologers in the United Kingdom. The instance of that man makes me believe that if we were to give the Irish-speaking population a chance of studying Irish as a literary language we might have a much larger number of persons studying Irish history and literature; and I think that it is an object with which everybody in this House who takes an interest in history and literature, whether he be an Irishman or not, will deeply sympathise. I must apologise for having detained the House so long, but without venturing to express an opinion upon the precise rules which ought to be made to meet the wishes of the Irish Members, I do think that they have made out a case for a much wider teaching of Irish then now exists, and I would suggest to the Chief Secretary that he should go fully into the subject. I think we are particularly fortunate in having a Chief Secretary who is himself a man of high literary ability and attainments, and who has, I feel sure, every sympathy with the study of Irish literature. If the right hon. Gentleman feels any doubt as to the best way in which this can be done, I hope that he will refer it for inquiry to those who have practical knowledge of the subject either in Wales or in Scotland, who are themselves men of educational experience, and that he will endeavour to induce the Commissioners to frame a scheme which will go far to meet the complaints made to-day, and thus turn the opportunities which Ireland offers in this matter to far better account.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: I find myself in such distinct agreement with the speech of the right hon. Gentleman that I have hardly any criticism to offer to his very valuable contribution to the debate, except in one particular. I do not think the right hon. Gentleman has fully realised the nature and extent of the demand which has been made. The hon. Member for Waterford began his speech by saying that the whole future of the Irish race was bound up in this question. I think that statement alone will indicate to the right hon. Gentleman that he has somewhat minimised what is now being asked for. I think the right hon. Gentleman will hardly be prepared to say that this is a question involving the whole future of the Irish race. The reason why the hon. Member for Waterford dwells so much upon this question, involving the future of the Irish race, is because he believes that the large mass of the children in Ireland speak the native language. When the hon. Member for Waterford quoted statistics upon this point, I interrupted him in the middle of his speech, because I thought the numbers which he gave to the Committee on this subject were extremely misleading. I have here an extract from the Report of the Census Commissioners of Ireland. From table 155 it will be seen that in 1881, 64,167 persons were returned as speaking Irish only, and that in 1891 the number so returned was 38,121, or 26,046 less than in 1881; also, that in 1881 the number of persons returned as able to speak Irish and English was 885,765, and that in 1891 it was 642,053, or 243,712 less than in 1881. It is perfectly clear that if the number of children affected by the changes asked for is confined to Irish-speaking districts it will not be anything like what the hon. Member for Waterford appears to imagine. The problem is not, therefore, such a very extensive one, and it must also be remembered that the numbers are diminishing at a very rapid rate. What, then, is the existing state of affairs? Since 1883 there has been a note in the Code of the Irish Commissioners which declares that where there are Irish-speaking pupils in the school a teacher acquainted with the Irish language should, wherever practicable, be employed, and that inspectors are at liberty to employ the vernacular if they think it desirable to do so. That note has been in the Code ever since 1883, and if it be true that, notwithstanding that, a knowledge of English has not been imparted through the vernacular, I think the managers must bear the larger share of the blame. The teachers are not appointed by the Board of Education, but by the managers, and, so far as I can see, there is really nothing in the old Code or in the new rules which have lately been issued to prevent the teaching of English through Irish. The hon. Member for Connemara has complained of the constitution of the Board of Education, but if anyone looks at the list of names upon that Board he will see that it includes some of the most distinguished men in Ireland, and for the hon. Member for Connemara to say that he does not know more than three or four

of them is to argue himself unknown. If it be true that there is nothing to prevent bilingual teaching, we must hold that if there is any difficulty about it it is largely due to the fact that the matter has not been pressed at all because the managers do not care about it, or because they were not able to find teachers who could speak Irish. I now come to the question of what it is that is being really asked for. It is very important that we should answer this question very clearly and precisely. I think that the speech of the hon. Member for Waterford threw a certain ambiguity over the question as to what the demand really was. If I am to judge from the pamphlet sent to me by the Gaelic League, the demands which are made are—

"(1) That in all places where Irish is the home language pupils shall be taught to read and write Irish from their first entrance into the school, and that a knowledge of English and other useful subjects shall be imparted through the medium of Irish."

That is the point to which my right hon. friend the Member for South Aberdeen alludes. The second demand is—

"That in all places where Irish is not the home language it shall be lawful to teach Irish as a remunerated subject within school hours, and at the earliest stage at which children are capable of learning it."

Now if Irish under that Code was a remunerated subject it would become a compulsory subject, and it means that wherever the managers in either an English or an Irish-speaking district think fit Irish might be made a compulsory subject. We ought, therefore, to keep these two demands strictly apart. As regards the first demand, which asks for something which now exists in Wales, I cannot see any great harm in it; on the contrary, I think from the educational point of view we ought to grant it, for I believe it would have good results. I entirely agree with all that has been said by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen upon that point. The hon. Member for East Down gave a very misleading analogy when he said that when anyone went abroad in order to learn a foreign language he was careful to go into a country where only its own language was spoken. But a man travelling abroad for this purpose is very different from poor ignorant children going to school. So far, then, I find myself quite in agreement with the demand put forward, and I believe that it would be better for the English itself that it be taught through Irish. As I have already said, I do not think that there is anything in the rules of the Commissioners, either in the new rules or the old rules, which would preclude this from being done. In the new rules there is nothing of a positive character upon this subject, and if the Commissioners see fit to propose a rule of a more positive character assimilating the rules in Irish-speaking districts to those in Welsh-speaking districts I should not oppose it. But as far as I am concerned, I have no actual power in the matter beyond making suggestions, and I cannot promise whether they will accept my suggestions or not. I may point out that Irish is now, and will be in the future, an extra subject taught out of school hours, and I think that is a very desirable thing, and I should be very sorry to see it omitted. The hon. Member for Waterford has spoken of a strong national feeling in favour of a revival of Irish in order that it may become the national language of Ireland.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I did not say that at all.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: I thought the hon. Member's remarks tended in that direction, but if I am wrong I apologise. If it is to be suggested that Irish should be a compulsory subject, whether in Irish-speaking districts or not, as far as I can see, the result would be to re-create Irish as the national language of Ireland. That I believe to be an impossibility, and I am not prepared to encourage it. Notwithstanding the numerous resolutions of public bodies and the expression of opinion from the benches opposite, I wish to point out that there is not in any private schools a real demand for the teaching of Irish as a compulsory subject. I do not find on the part of parents who send their children to secondary schools a demand that Irish should be compulsory. In the higher colleges in Ireland is Irish a compulsory subject? I can find absolutely no trace of anything of the kind. Take the case of Queen's College, Galway. In 1897–98 there was only one student who attended the lectures on Irish; in 1898–99 nobody attended, and no one has attended this session. The fact is that there is no real, genuine, spontaneous desire in Ireland to revive Irish as the national language. I am glad of this, for

it would be a retrograde step, doomed to failure. These remarks I merely make by the way, because it seems to me that the important question, after all, is whether it is desirable that the bilingual system should be applied also to Ireland. Personally I have no objection to bilingual teaching in Gaelic districts, although I foresee great difficulties in the way of providing teachers competent to instruct in the vernacular. I do not think, however, that very much time should be spent upon teaching children to write Irish, but I hold that where Irish is the home language it would be better that instruction in that language should be given.

MR. HARRINGTON (Dublin, Harbour): I do not think that the speech of the right hon. Gentleman is satisfactory. Although he has declared himself in favour of the first part of our proposal, I may point out that he did not tell us of any means by which his sympathy can be carried into effect. It is idle to throw upon the managers the responsibility for not having this bilingual system of teaching put into force. The whole scheme is devised upon lines which render it impossible for school managers to get teachers who can teach that system. There is not one word in the curriculum to compel teachers to learn Irish, and no reward is offered to them for doing so. The whole question is absolutely ignored in the training colleges. What we want to know is whether the Commissioners of Education are going to encourage the teachers to learn Irish, and to impart a knowledge of Irish to such pupils as may desire to learn it. I do not want to make any attack upon the Commissioners of National Education, and I do not agree with the attacks which have been made upon them. I believe the Commissioners are being hampered by other difficulties, and the reason why they have not a better system is the fault of the Government. I know the gentleman who presides over the National Board would never have delivered the speech he did upon the question of teaching Irish if he had not the assent of his colleagues, and if he had not believed that his words might have some effect when the rules were revised. I do not share the view that there is no strong national demand in Ireland in connection with this question. In my opinion no movement has made such progress during the last ten or twelve years as the teaching of the Irish language. I remember when it was a rare thing in the city of Dublin to hear a man speaking Irish; now it is common to hear men conversing in Irish, who learned it either by their own industry or through some Gaelic association, and without having had any particular assistance from any educational source. The right hon. Gentleman also referred to the fact that no attention seemed to be given to the teaching of Irish in the colleges in Ireland. But how can Irish be taught in the colleges if you do not begin with the junior pupils in the primary schools? Surely it is not at college that the study of Irish should be commenced, and it is not likely that any number will devote themselves to Irish when no inducement of any kind is held out to them. The right hon. Gentleman throws the responsibility on the managers of schools for not having teachers who can teach in Irish in the Irish-speaking districts, but I know very well that managers would be extremely glad if they were able to get teachers who would be able to teach children through the medium of Irish. But they are restricted to teachers trained under the National Board. They have no choice. The moment a manager appoints a teacher not classed by the National Board the grant to the school ceases. The managers have not a free hand, and there is no endeavour made by the Commissioners to prepare teachers in Irish, which is the natural language of a great proportion of the people. I have been in districts in the west of Kerry where you could not find half a dozen persons who could speak English. I have seen the children in the schools, and it was positively painful to hear them reading pages of English not one word of which they understood, and then the moment they found themselves in the playground they addressed each other in Irish. These children could not explain what they were reading, and if you addressed them in English they would not understand what was said. Surely the Commissioners cannot contend that they are carrying out the trust placed in them as long as there is a large number of children in such a condition as that. I would say that the hon. Member for East Down was in himself a deplorable example of what the system of national education

can do in Ireland, for there was neither sentiment, nor soul, nor nationality in his speech. He might have belonged to any nationality in the world. Education from his point of view is education that will enable a person to get on in the world, and which has neither traditions, nor memories, nor sentiment, nor soul. The hon. Member spoke of its being a disadvantage to the children to be taught anything at all of their own natural language, and, according to him, it would be better if they were transferred to a portion of the country where they could speak only English. That is not the view of persons who have studied this question, and that is not the opinion of the Chief Secretary. The right hon. Gentleman was sympathetic, and we could expect nothing more from him, so far as giving an expression of opinion, than we had from him this evening; but a mere pious expression of opinion on the part of the National Board that English may be taught through the medium of Irish will have no practical result unless an effort is made to provide that that opinion is carried out. The teachers must be prepared, and there must be some inducement held out to them to learn Irish. It is not a remunerated subject now, and the teacher is supposed to be such an enthusiastic lover of the Irish language that when the work for which he is paid is done, and when his duty to the State and his pupils is discharged, he will gather the pupils around him and deliver his soul to them in Irish. The teachers must have an extraordinary amount of enthusiasm and zeal if they take up this subject after their ordinary work is done. Surely the National Board ought to be able to devise some means to reward teachers for a knowledge of Irish in districts where it is essential for carrying out their work. Then, as to the other demand, I would inform the Chief Secretary that he entirely misapprehends the position if he thinks that the Gaelic League or any hon. Member in this House has the slightest intention of displacing English and getting the people of Ireland to speak Irish only. Lunacy has not increased to that extent. What we demand is that in districts where the children hear nothing but Irish in their homes they should be taught English through the medium of Irish, and that in addition to teaching them English some effort should be made at the same time to give them a literary knowledge of the Irish language. The Chief Secretary spoke of placing schools in Ireland in the same position as schools in Wales as regards the national language. He will not do that by a mere expression of opinion, or by a mere permissive authority on the part of the National Board, that if teachers know Irish, and can teach it, the Board have no objection. We want something more. We want the books in use in the schools in Irish-speaking districts to be Irish books, just as in Wales the school books are in Welsh. The National Board know perfectly well that the note they have placed in their Code can have no effect. Teachers will not devote their time to teaching Irish after ordinary hours without pay or reward. That is not putting us in the same position as Wales. Welsh is a remunerated subject in Welsh schools, and the school-books are printed in both Welsh and English. Let the right hon. Gentleman place us in that position, and the whole of our demand will be conceded.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flintshire Boroughs): Frequent reference has been made in the course of this debate to Welsh experience, and perhaps, therefore, it may not be unbecoming for a Welsh Member to say a few words on this question. I would venture to say that all my hon. friends from Wales heartily concur in the reasonable and moderate request which has been put forward by the Irish Members. The Chief Secretary has, I think, exaggerated to some extent the nature of the demand that has been made. I will not enter into the question whether his assurances are sufficiently satisfactory; that is a question for the Irish Members; but I am heartily glad to hear that the right hon. Gentleman does intend practically to apply to Ireland the system that prevails in Wales, and that should prevail in Ireland also.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: All that the Irish Government can do in the matter is to suggest the change to the Commissioners, and to sanction it when it is proposed.

MR. LEWIS: I can only hope, then, that the Commissioners will take the same enlightened view of the question that the right hon. Gentleman takes, and that his great influence will be used to introduce

into Ireland a similar system to that of Wales. As far as the Welsh system is concerned, we can speak in the highest terms of the success that has attended it. The Welsh language is an admirable educational instrument. The difference in idiom, construction, and forms of expression are much greater between the Welsh and English languages than between English and French or German, and it adds enormously to the mental culture of a child to be taught a language which is as essentially different from English as is Greek or Latin. The fact is that modern European languages are too much on the same plan; but when we come to the Celtic languages the difference between them and the Teutonic languages is so immense that they improve very greatly the mental faculties of the children who study them. I might quote the Report of the Central Board of Education in Wales in confirmation of that view, which states that the bilingual training involved in the parallel study of two languages so dissimilar as English and Welsh must be of marked value to the pupils. The right hon. Gentleman referred to the fact that Irish was not largely taught in the colleges and universities of Ireland. I will tell him why. The hon. Member who spoke last offered a perfectly adequate explanation of that. You do not begin at the bottom, and you cannot expect this kind of instruction to come from the top. We have Welsh taught in our elementary schools in Wales, and we have it taught now, not only in the intermediate schools, but also in the university. I may mention also a fact that may be of interest to hon. Gentlemen, that Welsh is even recognised in the local examinations of Cambridge University as a specific subject. Looked at simply from the point of view of its educational value, one could not possibly find for Welsh children a better vehicle of instruction than their own tongue, and I see no reason why the same process should not apply in every respect to the Irish language. The hon. Member for East Down asked hon. Members from Ireland on this side of the House whether they taught their own children the Irish language. All I can say in regard to that is that twenty or thirty years ago in Wales the Welsh language was considered a rather unfashionable and even a vulgar language, and people in the upper ranks of society were rather more ashamed of it than otherwise. What is the case at present? Why, peers and M.P.'s and people belonging to other ranks of society take the greatest care to have their children taught the language of the country. Well would it be if that were the case in Ireland; because, after all, the language of a country is one of the shortest ways to the hearts of its people. A few weeks ago I travelled in Brittany, and in diligence and railway carriage I often conversed in the Breton language as far as I could. The Welsh and Breton languages are much more similar than the Welsh and Irish languages, and by conversing in the Breton language I found my way at once to the hearts of the people. Their faces lighted up with interest and admiration when they found a foreigner speaking a language which they supposed was their own, but which was the language of a country beyond the seas as well. I saw in a leading journal this morning the following statement—

> "To provide for the efficient teaching of Irish in the Ireland of the present day would be to subsidise the study of a dead language under great difficulties and without any of the advantages of the cultivation of classical literature."

The gentlemen who write for the newspaper from which I have quoted are all men of great ability and great culture, but there was never a greater mistake than to say that the Irish language is a dead language. I hope it is no more a dead language than is Welsh. Perhaps we in Wales have had certain advantages. Our Sunday schools have kept the Welsh language alive, and at the present time a larger number of people speak it than in any previous period in the history of Wales, and a greater number can speak it and write it grammatically than ever before. I should like to refer to another statement in the newspaper from which I have already quoted. It is as follows—

> "Neither in Wales nor in Brittany have the consequences of fostering the Celtic dialects been such as to encourage enlightened men to labour for the artificial creation of a similar state of things in Ireland."

I will tell the House how the Welsh language was "fostered" early in this century, and, I believe, also very considerably into the latter half of the century. It was the custom in Wales

to give what was called a "token"—a very heavy wooden billet—to a boy who spoke the Welsh language in a day school, and he was obliged to carry it on his back as a token of disgrace until he had found some other boy who had broken into the Welsh language also, and then it was transferred to him. I know perfectly well that the Irish language has been discouraged in similar and, perhaps, more cruel ways than that in the past, but I think we have now arrived at a state of things when the Philistinism which Mathew Arnold denounced so fiercely is passing away. We have now arrived at a more enlightened state, and we now recognise that the languages of the smaller nations have their part to play in the economy of the world, and that it is not right to trample them out of existence. I think the Irish child ought to be taught to respect the language of his hearth and home, and ought to obtain a grammatical and literary knowledge of that language. It is true we have in Wales a large number of magnificent publications in the Welsh language, £200,000 worth of Welsh books being published every year, and so far as modern literature is concerned, undoubtedly we will not yield the palm to any branch of the Celtic race. But in ancient literature we must acknowledge that Ireland is richer than most countries, although little is known of it at the present time, and even that little is only known to the cultured few. I hope the day is not far distant when every Irish child will be taught his own language in his own elementary school and will be able to read the classics of his own land, and then we may see Irish scholars taking a deeper interest in their own language and conferring fresh honours on it. I did not intend to trespass so far on the patience of the Committee, but I must say I was to some degree inspired by the magnificent peroration of the hon. Member for Waterford. After all, a language is a precious possession of a country. I put it to English Members, supposing the English language was in the same position, supposing, instead of being the language of the world, it was the language only of the Home Counties; does any one suppose that they would not cling to it, although it was only the language of the few, and perhaps of the despised few? There are other than mere material considerations. You cannot measure everything by a cash value, but you can attach even a cash value to the training of the mind, and believing as I do that the study of the Celtic language by the children who speak it in their homes is a valuable method of training the mind, I heartily support the motion.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Kerry, W.): We have all listened with great interest and pleasure to the speech of the hon. Member. For Irishmen it is a great thing to know that there is at all events one part of the world in which the Celtic tongue is so cherished and so vigorous. The statement of the hon. Member about the punishment inflicted on the Welsh children in days gone by for speaking their own language comes quite home to us, because not so long ago children in Ireland who spoke Irish were immediately punished. The speech of the Chief Secretary was, on the whole, unsatisfactory. I have no fault to find with its tone, and I have no intention of falling foul with the right hon. Gentleman on that score. But his speech was exactly the same sort of speech to which we have listened for years. This question of the encouragement of the Irish language has been raised on these benches as long as I can remember, and although the present Chief Secretary was a little more conciliatory and slightly more sympathetic in his remarks, his speech was exactly the same as the speeches of his predecessors. It leads to nothing of a practical nature. The right hon. Gentleman tells us he sympathises with us. We are much obliged to him. Then he tells us he has no power to give practical effect to his sympathy; that he has no power to deal with the Commissioners or to make any change whatever in the scheme under which education in Ireland is administered. I think the right hon. Gentleman has a very easy way of giving effect to his good wishes. All he need do is to bring in a Bill making the encouragement of the Irish language in the Irish schools not only permissive but compulsory. If the right hon. Gentleman would bring in such a Bill even at the present period of the session, I can promise him it would be passed in three days. Therefore there is no ground for the attitude which the right hon. Gentleman has taken up. The right hon. Gentleman laid some share of

blame for the condition of the Irish language in Ireland on the attitude of the managers of Irish schools. As far as I know, there is no body of men more anxious that Irish should be properly taught in the Irish schools than the managers. The Irish hierarchy, who I presume may be trusted to speak for the Irish managers, have emphatically pronounced the opinion that the Irish language ought to be encouraged. Not many days ago we saw an interesting statement signed by the managers of National schools in Connaught, in which they unanimously expressed the desire that the Irish language should be encouraged in the National schools, and in my own constituency the managers are also unanimously in favour of this movement. So far as the managers are concerned, the right hon. Gentleman would find no difficulty. The right hon. Gentleman tells us that there is nothing in the rules of the Board of Education to prevent the study of the Irish language. The great difficulty, in my mind, is that, under the old rules, and still more under the new, there is no inducement given to Irish teachers to teach the Irish language in their schools. They are supposed to teach it out of school hours, and they get no remuneration for it. That is much worse than no system at all. The right hon. Gentleman made a strong point when he said that educated people in Ireland do not insist on their children being taught Irish. Well, the reason of that is exceedingly simple. There is no opportunity for teaching children of the upper classes in Ireland Irish, and no assistance is given by the Government for teaching Irish in the lower schools; and under the intermediate system the study of Irish is not encouraged. The result is that there are practically no grammars and other books for teaching Irish. The right hon. Gentleman mentioned, as an instance of the small interest taken in the Irish language, that there was only one student of Irish in Queen's College, Galway. That case is an unfortunate one, because the right hon. Gentleman knows that very few Catholics in Ireland will send their children to be educated in Queen's Colleges. The right hon. Gentleman has reiterated his sympathy with this question, but I hope he will go further, and, instead of having it brought up year after year in this extremely unsatisfactory fashion, that next year he will be in a position to introduce a measure, supposing the National Education Board do not take proper steps meanwhile, to encourage the study of the Irish language. I have no cause of complaint for the very cautious manner in which the right hon. Gentleman gave us some of the reasons for the faith that is in him. He told us it was monstrous to attempt to revive a dead language. Thank God, Irish is not yet a dead language, although at the present moment it is in danger; and that is one of the reasons why the Irish Members want some means taken by which it will never become a dead language. The point which the right hon. Gentleman overlooked, and which is persistently overlooked in this House, is that the people of Ireland are determined that the Irish language shall be assisted, and as far as possible revived. This is a repetition of the whole question of ninety-nine years ago, that the people are determined to be governed in accordance with their own wishes. The people of Ireland are unanimous in their desire for the revival of the Irish language, and no matter what arguments, based on so-called justice and common sense, may be brought against us, we are determined to maintain our position. I am not, however, afraid to meet hon. Gentlemen on the grounds of practical common sense. One hon. Gentleman asked whether there was any country in Europe where more than one language was spoken by working men. There are, as a matter of fact, so many countries in Europe where they speak two languages, that the difficulty is to find a country where only one is spoken. The hon. Gentleman was particularly unfortunate in his reference to Switzerland, because in most districts in that country two languages are spoken by all the people, and in many, three. In the neighbouring country of France, in every single Department, two languages, at least, are spoken. In fact, there are more patois and dialects spoken in France than in any other country in the world. For instance, in the South, Bernaise and French are spoken; in the West, Breton and French; in the East, German and French in Alsace-Lorraine; in the North-East, Walloon and French.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER (Belfast, W.): Are these taught in the schools?

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE: I never was at a school there, and I cannot tell; but I do not think that the hon. Gentleman can say, of his own knowledge, that they are not. I go to Belgium, where I have lived, and there Flemish is taught in the schools in the same way as French—the two languages go on side by side. Then take the case of Hungary, which is peculiarly interesting, because we Irish are constantly reminded that there is so much that is generally characteristic in the history of the two countries. In different parts of Hungary Magyar and German are spoken; Magyar and Roumanian, Magyar and Polish, Magyar and Russian, Magyar and Czech, Magyar and Croat, and in every one of these districts they get on extremely well with the two languages. Another point in connection with Hungary is of extreme interest, and that is that not so very long ago, not two generations ago, the Hungarian language was forbidden, and the official language of the Diet and the courts of law was Latin; and if any other language was spoken it was either German, Wallachian, or a Slav dialect. The Hungarians fought the battle of their language in the same way as they fought their political battles, and now all over Hungary Magyar is spoken, although seventy or eighty years ago it was said to be a dead language. An hon. Gentleman on the other side of the House talked of the difficulty of reviving a dead language, but the great advantage in regard to Irish is that it is not a dead language. It is spoken by, at all events, half a million of people in Ireland, and there is no difficulty whatever in preserving it, if the Government will only give us some small assistance. I am very sorry to say that I cannot speak Irish myself. I have not had the opportunity of learning it, as I do not come from an Irish-speaking district; but I take a great interest in this question on literary, historical, and national grounds. I do not suppose that the last of these grounds commends itself to our opponents. But I represent a constituency where there is a very large Irish-speaking population, and I should be wanting in my duty to them if I did not intervene in this debate in behalf of the Irish language. The Chief Secretary objects to the programme laid before him by the Gaelic League. He says it is too extensive, and not of a practical nature; but I can assure the right hon. Gentleman that the League speaks for the people of Ireland. The sentiment which is behind the Gaelic League, and from which they derive their great influence, is spread all over the country, and is daily increasing in strength and volume. Their first proposal is that there should be the teaching of the Irish language in the Irish-speaking districts. The right hon. Gentleman agrees to that, although he says that he has no power to give effect to it. But I hope he will discover before next session some way of giving effect to it. The other proposal is that Irish should be made worthy of study by the teachers in the Irish schools, so that they might be better fitted to teach it to their pupils, and that they should be given an opportunity of teaching it to pupils in other than Irish-speaking districts. I regret that the right hon. Gentleman has not adopted a more sympathetic attitude in regard to that point. I think it will not be necessary, at the present stage, that the teaching of Irish should be made compulsory in the non-Irish-speaking districts; but the people of Ireland have a fair right to claim that when they wish their children to learn Irish they should get teachers qualified to instruct them. I do not think that is an impossible demand. I would like to reassure the right hon. Gentleman that this is not a question with which, after all, the people of Ireland do not feel sympathy. It is emphatically a national question, and representatives of every school of politics and creeds have expressed themselves in favour of it, from the hierarchy down to boards of guardians. I would suggest to the right hon. Gentleman that he should consider this matter seriously, as a question which recommends itself to the Government on grounds of policy, if for no other reason. It is a question that can very easily be settled, and it would be judicious and wise on the part of the Government to do so. All we ask is similarity of treatment with the other parts of the United Kingdom, and that the principles of Unionism should be put in force. Before the last general election we heard a great deal about the equality of treatment of all parts of the United Kingdom, but we did not hear so much about it afterwards. Another election is approaching, and the Government should give some proof of their desire to afford equality of treat-

ment in Ireland with that of the people in Wales and in the Highlands of Scotland. The people in Ireland will be very easily satisfied on this point. Probably there may be some trouble in certain parts of Ireland, unless some steps are taken to meet the feelings of the people in this matter. At all events, the feeling is strong enough to make the carrying on of the National School system a matter of difficulty, unless the teaching of the Irish language is conceded. I appeal to the right hon. gentleman, however, on much higher grounds than that. The government of the British Empire is committed to many educated and intellectual men, and no higher duty can fall upon them than the encouragement of the mental training and culture of those over whom they rule. Behind this question of the Irish language there remains that of cultivating the minds of the Irish people by enabling them to enjoy the beauties of their historic literature, their poetry, and their native traditions. On these high, and perhaps ideal, grounds it is the duty of the Government to support the teaching of the Irish language. I would remind the right hon. Gentleman that the English Government has in other countries done very much to encourage and preserve native languages. In New Zealand the Maori language would have died out long ago had it not been for the action of the representatives of the British Government, who had books published in the Maori language, and the Maoris were taught to read and write in their own tongue. The same may be said of the language of Samoa, and many other places which, either permanently or temporarily, have been brought under the British Government. Surely if it was worth while to preserve the language and literature of the Maoris it is much more worth while to preserve the language and literature of Ireland. I would remind the right hon. Gentleman once again that this is a most important question, that there is an immense amount of popular feeling for it, and that it would be wise for the Government to concede something to that feeling.

MR. T. M. HEALY: It is a rule that when any question is brought forward by the Irish Members and resisted by the Government, that resistance is based either on the ground that the demand will cost money, or that the result will have some effect on the Act of Union. Now, Nationalists in Ireland, or most of them, can already speak English, and they detest the system of English government quite heartily enough already, so that it cannot be suggested that a knowledge of the English language or acquaintance with the abuse which is cast on the name and fame of Ireland, on its literature and its religion, has in any way increased the attachment of Irishmen to the system of government established in that country. Consequently it is absurd to suggest that any further culture or extension of the knowledge of Irish would in any way militate against the continuance of the existence of that system. So that we may dismiss from our minds the idea that the Government would receive any help for their case from the fact that the Irish speak English. Indeed I can conceive that if we only used the Irish language our detestation of the English would never have been half so great as it is, because we could never have understood what was said. I take as an instance of the reason which exists for our detestation the sentiment expressed in the speech of the hon. and learned Member for East Down. As I understood him he put his case altogether on the fact that English is a practical language, and that what we have to do with is the practical affairs of this life; and in hard and bitter language he complained that we and our teachers encouraged nothing but sentiment. I am always glad to get information, and I bow before the pundit opposite; but, if there is a great deal of practical advantage to be got from the knowledge of the English language, and if the hon. and learned Gentleman is so much better equipped in that respect than our poor selves, why should he not turn his great genius to some better account than looking for an English County Court judgeship? We always find the Government putting up on these occasions some one to express their real sentiments who is on the cadge for a job. The line taken by the hon. and learned Gentleman, who is used on every occasion as the merest utensil of the Government, and who is put up as a so-called independent Member to express his own opinions, but who, of course, speaks the real sentiments of the

Government, is really one of the reasons why I say the knowledge of English possessed by Irish Members occasionally adds to our detestation of the established system of government in Ireland. Even so, the fact that the hon. Gentleman's English is so admirable, is supported by his statement that nothing was more valued by him in his domestic home and in the educational circumstances of his home, than "The Spelling-book Superseded." As I thought, that was the measure of the Philistinism of the hon. and learned Member. As a vehicle of knowledge, of learning, and of the higher thought, the hon. and learned Gentleman recommends to all his friends and following the constant use of "The Spelling-book Superseded"! He has told us that Irish was absolutely unknown abroad. I will not go back to the days of the Comarba, who made the Irish tongue familiar from Norway in the North to the Mediterranean in the South. There are names in Norway of churches called after Irish saints; and Irish saints are venerated in every little hamlet in Germany, France, and Italy. I will not go back to these ancient days, but I will come to a later period when French generals and the Emperor Napoleon found no difficulty but great value in using a few words of the Irish language, especially when they were backed up by the bayonets of the Connaught Rangers. No doubt the Irish language was necessary in South Africa when the Irish Fusiliers sprang to their heroic deeds. At all events, we are living in the year in which we have been graciously permitted, both for ourselves and our soldiers, by Her Majesty the Queen to wear the shamrock; and we have been favoured in the same year by the gracious visit of Her Majesty to Ireland. That has not cost the English a single halfpenny; and in a similar economic frame of mind it would not have added the burden of one sixpence to the Educational Estimates of this country if the demand now asked for from these Irish Benches had been granted. I think I have demonstrated two facts—first, that the knowledge of English does not increase the love of English Government in Ireland; and, second, that the teaching of Irish to the children of Ireland would not add to the expense of the English Government. There is no expense attached to that demand. How, therefore, can you on that ground resist a proposal put forward in the name of at least three-fourths of the people of Ireland? Supposing the Government were dealing with an island in the southern seas which they were anxious to retain, and they found the entire people of that island had put forward an humble demand that they should be allowed to use their tongue, which was in sympathy with the religion and sentiment of the country, would anyone say it would not be wise on the part of the Home Government to consent and tolerate it? Take Jersey, where the French language is still spoken in all its native purity, and where the French language is taught in the schools at the expense of the local rates. Would it not be considered madness if the Government which is established there adopted the same attitude towards the people of the Channel Islands as that which is taken up by certain persons here? I think that attitude is especially injurious upon the part of those who come from districts which would not be affected by this demand. Why should they raise any objection with regard to us? They say it is for our good, and that we should be wasting our time. Surely if we want to waste our time it is no affair of theirs. We do not take any money out of their pockets. We leave them in the enjoyment of the "Spelling-book Superseded." Why they should desire that the bishops of Ireland should be flouted, or that the people of Connemara, Donegal, or Kerry should be deprived of the knowledge of their ancient tongue, I leave to the wisdom of greater men than I. I was in Donegal some little time ago, and I heard children reading English, and they could read it perfectly; but when I asked them the meaning of the commonest words they did not understand them—they did not even understand the "Spelling-book Superseded," and the British Government, forsooth, maintains that system of education as if it was in some way appropriate to bolster up the Act of Union. But the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary said—and I think it was somewhat mean for a man of his talents—"We throw no obstable in the way." Quite so; but what does he do? He further says, "It is not any fault of ours at all; it is the fault of the school

managers." The managers do not pick out whom they choose to teach the children. This was the system which the Catholics established for themselves. They established Catholic colleges for the training of teachers, and the Protestants have done the same thing; and then the true instinct of the Presbyterians, which is to pay nothing if it can be avoided, was discovered, and it is they who are really running the whole show. The training college for teachers in Dublin at the present moment is the training college for the Presbyterians. The right hon. Gentleman having established that system, and having provided that the teachers shall have no training in Irish, and shall not have the means of getting hold of it, and as the school manager must take one of these men who are called "classed," says, "You can get whom you like." It is nonsense; we demand something more. It is something to bewail in any country that one should not know the meaning of the names of the rivers and town lands and common things which affect the life and history of the country, more especially when in many places—and not only places, but personal names—the easier and shorter names have been changed and demoralised into what they now are. May I ask this of the bread-and-butter test Gentlemen: do you not teach Anglo-Saxon in one of your colleges? I understand that there is in one even a chair for Sanscrit, but I am not aware that anybody now asks for tea and sugar in Sanscrit. That, I understand, is the new test, but I wish to put it on a higher level than a question of a tea and sugar policy. It is a portion of the national life of the country, and it is a loss by the people of Irish music through the loss of their native language. Irish music has perished among the Irish people because it was set to Irish songs, which were sung at the fireside, and when the language of the land passed away there were no English words set to this music. We know a great deal about Irish music, but supposing Moore had not written three-fourths of the songs, Irish music would have disappeared. Does the Government owe Ireland no compensation for having destroyed her music, her monasteries, and her woollen manufactures? I do not suggest it even as a matter of sentiment, but as a matter of right. We do not ask for a costly thing, we do not ask for an additional bawbee; but is it not worth while to placate the sentiment of the country? It is not a case which assails the Nonconformist conscience; it is not like the great University question—there is no undue contact with Rome. There is no going back to what have been called the glorious days before the Union. I wonder sometimes that the English do not feel that this is their duty. Irish Members are constantly told that this is a Unionist Parliament, and that in all things in connection with local affairs this Parliament is willing to give them absolute satisfaction. We do not ask for the time of Parliament; we do not ask for a Treasury Bill, or any other which would occupy five minutes consideration. The whole thing could be done by a rule which does not even require Parliamentary sanction. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary said—and this is what makes the British Government a matter so hard to explain—that he was not responsible; it was all the National Board. What is that Board? In the first place, in a country three-fourths Catholic, the constitution of the Board requires that half the members should be Protestants. One would imagine that the Government, having put down its hand, would say that the National Board should be in consonance with the complexion of the country; but they first stuff the Board with half their own kind, Protestants, and then they bring in a few weak-kneed Catholics as stuffing for the others. There was a vacancy upon the Board, and, as I said yesterday, there was a scheme to fill that vacancy with a judge, and they put in Mr. Justice Gibson.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: That was not our doing; it was the action of the National Board.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Why does not the Government play the game with the cards upon the table? What is the use of making such an observation as that? It deceives nobody. I repeat what I said yesterday, that an Irish judge has quite enough to do to attend to his judicial duties, and I respectfully submit that he has no right on a Board of Education. He was not put there to see that educa-

tion was properly conducted, or that the proper subjects were taught; he was put there as the sentinel of the British Government to prevent Irish history and the Irish language being taught in the schools, and then the English Government, when they have packed the jury, say they are not responsible. It is absurd to suggest that the right hon. Gentleman can put upon the shoulders of the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland the responsibility which belongs to the British Government itself. Everybody knows that in Dublin Castle, if the smallest wish were expressed for anything which a Government Department wants, they would have it the next afternoon. How is Ireland managed? A few dinners at the Castle, a few Orders of St. Patrick, a few knighthoods, and a few advances in salary. There is not a man in Ireland honestly attached to the system. The landlords stand up for you because of their rents; if they were sure of their rents under a Nationalist Parliament they would join us in a moment, especially if they could see their way to 5 per cent. extra. All the official class are on the make. They are not satisfied with their salary, they want an advance, and when they get that they want a pension, and when that is provided they want promotion for somebody else. I wonder if there is any one in the world who despises the Irish more than a Chief Secretary for Ireland. I would like to see the diary of an Irish Secretary, stuffed with the letters he has received, and the applications for advances, baronetcies, and promotions, and the miserable intrigues that are carried on in order to obtain these things, with the great majority of the Irish population standing sullenly aside and looking on with absolute contempt and derision of the whole system. Does the right hon. Gentleman say he could not have Irish taught? He could do it by telephone. Call up the Education Board: "'Are you there, Education Department?' 'Yes, your honour.' 'Have Irish taught in the morning.' 'Yes, your honour,'" and it is done. Why can it not be done? Because it would have to go through the whole list of the right hon. Gentlemen's appointees, and you would find that everybody wants something else. Independence of character in the official classes is entirely absent. There is no freedom of thought, except among the poor class. The rich are either running after invitations to dinner or the Order of St. Patrick. The right hon. Gentleman tells us that our views cannot be met. I want to know the reason why. You have got the Army, Navy, and Volunteers to uphold your system. You have the tax-gatherer coming round to collect the taxes, and we should still be paying £3,000,000 too much, and for what earthly reason our views cannot be met, except the bottom hatred that prevails against everything Irish in the minds of our rulers, I cannot see. But it is because you refuse to accord to us these small matters, which you say are mere matters of sentiment, but which are the just demands of our country, that the connection between the two countries is, and will always continue to be, one of hatred and mistrust.

*THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE FOR IRELAND (Mr. PLUNKETT, Dublin Co., S.): I wish to say a few words in this debate, because the question on which we shall divide is one which might make a man appear to be voting against his convictions. I entirely associate myself with the attitude of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary, who appears to me to have approached this matter in the most sensible and practical manner. I went into these districts for the purpose of satisfying myself upon this question, and my mind is fully made up upon it. I can give the Committee one curious instance of the necessity of teaching in bilingual districts through the medium of the Irish language. Some of my friends were anxious to introduce the German system of agricultural credit, and in these districts we found it absolutely necessary to teach that system through the Irish language. We had to employ an Irish organiser and have our leaflets translated into Irish. That is a good practical illustration of the bilingual teaching which many of us are anxious to see. Coming to the question of what can be done and what is best to be done, what are the facts that prompt hon. Members opposite to say that a minority of the Commissioners of Education have overruled the majority in the matter of teaching the

Irish language? I am informed that the matter has never come before the Commissioners at all except in the shape of resolutions in identical terms from a large number of public bodies. The only way that it seems to me that the matter can properly come before them is through the managers, and no manager, I am informed, has made any request to the Commissioners upon the subject; when they do it will be quite time to rate the Commissioners upon their inaction. The Commissioners, in the meantime, have adopted a new rule that within the limit of the curriculum the managers shall arrange the programme of their schools to suit the needs of the locality within which that school is situated. That is a very sensible endeavour to do away with that rigidity of programme and over-centralisation to which the hon. Gentleman who opened this debate made reference. The object of this rule is to introduce that elasticity into the programme which, I take it, we all desire. Many hon. Gentlemen coming from those districts will be able to say better than I, but the impression I gained in many of these districts was that the people themselves were not strongly in favour of Irish being taught. Those of us who have travelled in America are aware that a large number of emigrants have been prejudiced owing to their want of familiarity with the English language, and in some districts it is believed that the bilingual system may lead to less teaching of the English language. We do not agree with that, but that is in the mind of the people. Another difficulty is that the managers say they cannot get Irish teachers. It was suggested by an hon. Member opposite that that difficulty would be easily overcome by the training college. I do not myself think it would, because it seems to me that the English-speaking teacher who had merely acquired a smattering of Irish, which is all he could acquire in a year, would not be much use in conveying to the minds of children the English tongue through the medium of the Irish language. What we want to abolish is the system of people teaching through a language with which they themselves are not familiar. The teachers should be Irish speaking in order to do what we wish to see done effectively. An hon. Member had complained that Irish had ceased to be a remunerative subject; it always was an extra subject, and can only now be a remunerative subject by being an extra subject. I do not now wish to occupy the time of the House further, for many hon. Members I know have come over from Ireland especially to debate this question, and therefore I only say in conclusion that, although this debate has no doubt done good, I believe that this question can be very much more easily dealt with by public opinion in Ireland. I believe the Chief Secretary in the speech he has made will have largely influenced the managers if they are not already converted to that view.

*MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.) said he was personally interested in this question, as in the county of Donegal, one of the divisions of which he represented, there were no fewer than 60,000 Irish-speaking people. It had frequently been said in the House that there was a larger percentage of illiterates in South Donegal than in any other constituency. If that was so it was absolutely due to the system of education which did not enable Irish-speaking children to be educated in the English language through the medium of the Irish language. He could not help thinking that the English Government had by that system perpetuated as far as they could the brutal proscription of language which remained on the Statute-book from former times. The habit of teaching children who could only speak Irish through the medium of English was so humorous that if it were not wicked it might well form part of the travesties of Mr. Gilbert. It was a curious thing that in this district, which through the operations of the English Government had been practically denied education, there were, when Ireland had a control of her own in educational matters, men who were famed throughout Europe for their scholarship. They founded monasteries on the Continent of Europe, and in England they founded Durham cathedral. The children of Donegal were now denied learning through the vile system of the English Government. The Chief Secretary had been told again and again of the evils which the system produced. By a stroke of his pen he could completely alter the system. All he had to do was to say that there should be Irish-

speaking teachers, and that English should be taught through the medium of the Irish language. It was a subterfuge to say that it was the fault of the managers of the schools. It was nothing of the kind. Managers had a most limited selection, and the number from whom they must select were not necessarily Irish-speaking teachers. He remembered that recently in the Transvaal one of the great grievances was that the Uitlanders were not allowed to address the Volkraad in their own language; but in Ireland the English Government did not allow Irish-speaking children to be taught in their own language. Could they not do in Ireland exactly what they had done in Wales? What was the great difficulty or distinguishing feature which precluded them from giving to the Irish-speaking people a chance of succeeding in the race of life? He confessed there was nothing more melancholy than to see, as they might in some parts of Ireland, men and women who could neither read nor write—splendid specimens of manhood and womanhood. They contrasted with all their ignorance and illiteracy most favourably with the Stock Exchange "bulls" and "bears," who could both read and write. On these grounds he hoped the hon. Gentleman would make a comprehensive change in the system. It could not but be said that so long as the system lasted and children were taught in school in a language different from their own vernacular, they were really proscribing the education of an entire race of people. They were denying them learning just as they endeavoured in former days to turn the Catholics to Protestantism. Although illiteracy had been truthfully charged against the peasants of Donegal, he felt that it was one of the meanest and vilest charges ever uttered, for the illiteracy had been forced on the people who had not only the greatest desire for learning, but also a natural capacity for it. What was asked was that all Irish-speaking children should be given teachers with whom they could communicate and should be taught in their own language. He had placed the question of the Irish language on a practical basis, but at the same time there were matters involved which were not of a merely material character. "Man doth not live by bread only." While these people had been shut out of all the benefits and chances of promotion in life, there was inflicted on them a still more grievous calamity—they were shut out from the intellectual delights to be found in the fields of knowledge which proper education would confer. What was asked would not increase the expenditure of the Government. He would urge the right hon. Gentleman to use his influence with the Commissioners to give the people the benefits of education through the medium of the Irish language. Of course, the right hon Gentleman dominated the Irish Commissioners and they would give the greatest consideration to any advice he would give. To deny to the people of the Irish-speaking districts teachers who understood the language was to carry out a barbarous penal system. They asked for an act of the very purest justice. His own constituency in Donegal had been proscribed from education long enough, and he hoped the English Government would now grant the request that was made.

MAJOR JAMESON (Clare, W.) said the right hon. Member for South Dublin had conveyed to the House an absolutely wrong impression in suggesting that if knowledge of the Irish language was not imparted it was the fault of the managers of the schools and not of the Government. Within the last three years the number of marks at examinations for Irish had been decreased, while the number of marks for Greek had been increased, and this notwithstanding hon. Gentlemen opposite twitted them by calling Irish a dead language. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Dublin was right in saying that he had made a few friends on that side of the House. The reason was that he had won for himself the hatred of many of the officials of Dublin Castle, and the hatred of the community in Ireland who disliked everything that was Irish. That was the reason why they thought something more of him on that side of the House. He could quite understand the position of the right hon. Gentleman, the Chief Secretary. They looked forward to the day when the Chief Secretary should be an Irishman, but he thought there would be no necessity for the present Chief Secretary to learn Irish. They

looked forward to the day when the officials would have alone the desires of the Irish people at heart. They did not ask hon. Members opposite to put their hands in their pockets for one sixpence; they merely asked to be allowed to carry out the wishes of the Irish people in regard to this matter. If the right hon. Gentleman refused this very small boon he would refuse what was the wish certainly of three-fourths of the Irish people.

MR. T. D. SULLIVAN (Donegal, W.) felt bound, as knowing the intensity of the feeling amongst bishops, priests, and people in favour of the contention the Irish Members were putting forward, to give some brief expression to the views he knew to obtain among the people. The most rev. Bishop O'Donnell, Bishop of Raphoe, was an ecclesiastic of high attainments and high culture, and he was one of the most devoted friends and earnest advocates of the principle being contended for that evening. The priests were men who spoke the Irish language, but there were numerous schools in his district taught according to the system of the National Board, which, instead of expediting education, was an obstacle and an obstruction. The most rapid way in which one could get a language, and the ideals represented by the language, into the minds of boys and girls was to explain them to them in a language they understood. It was simply cruel to hold young people back from the degree of advancement they would gain in coming time if they were rightly treated. They were told the present system was due to a desire on the part of their beneficent British rulers to give the young people a chance of an early start in life, to make their way in the world when they left their native soil. If it was the well being and advancement of the Irish people that were desired by the English Government, that desire could have been shown in many ways, but it had not been done. The claim for a Catholic University might be taken as a test. If the Government wanted to cultivate the flower of Irish intellect, genius, and scholarship, they could have acceded to that fair and reasonable request of the Irish people of all creeds and classes. There were no doubt a few bigots who made a little noise, beat drums, and pretended to be much greater and more powerful than they really were. But they were a mere handful and a small minority. They had, however, succeeded in frightening the British Government, which professed not to be afraid of any race or people. The Government were afraid of the Orange drum, which had been beaten in Ulster, but why not in this matter have regard for Irish sentiment? Why not show some sense of gratitude? Although a long story it was a true story, and not a legend, that Irishmen educated and Christianised a great part of England. In their great schools the Irish gave free education and free food to the students who came across from England. In the great city of Armagh there existed one of the great Irish schools to which students came from England to learn knowledge and civilisation. What better could Ireland do for England than make Christians of Pagans, and make ignorant people intelligent? But what reward did they get? They had this national system, which was not carried out, devised, or designed according to the views, wishes, or feelings of the Irish people. It was a foreign institution; a foreign spirit ruled it from first to last; and it was high time the Irish people rose in revolt against it. There was now a revolt in Ireland against this cruel system, and it need not be imagined that it was a little sentimental outburst, coming up like a flower, which would wither away again very shortly. It was the commencement of a great national movement, and the movement was growing, increasing, and strengthening every day. Young men and women were joining Gaelic classes who had never heard Irish spoken before, and they were learning the Gaelic tongue with enthusiasm. He knew young people who had never heard Gaelic spoken in their own homes, but who were now teaching Gaelic classes in Ireland. That showed how the movement was growing, and he claimed for it the fair play and sympathy of a cultured and enlightened people. Everybody knew how it broadened a man's intellectual power to learn another language; if he knew but one tongue he was cabined, cribbed and confined in his search after knowledge. There were many arguments which might be advanced in favour of this moderate demand of the Irish nation. He had no doubt the

English rulers had hoped to kill out the Irish language; they thought it was doomed to death; but it was fated not to die. England was always robbing Ireland of one thing or another, but this was something the English did not want for themselves, and yet would not allow the Irish to have. Irish lands were confiscated, Irish manufactures destroyed. Ireland was robbed of her Parliament, and the English did their best to rob her of her religion, but in that they were defeated. She was plundered by overtaxation, but after all these grabbings and takings she asked only for fair play for her young people in keeping alive and cultivating their mother tongue. He pleaded that no obstacles should be thrown in the way, but that the movement should be helped and encouraged. England would be no poorer or worse for it, but Ireland would be much happier. At present the language was one of the relics of the past; Ireland's ancient history was bound up with it, and she would not part with it. He was thankful and proud to have lived to see the day when there was a great movement in that direction, and a revival of Irish feeling in that respect, and he was confident that the movement would thrive, prosper, and succeed. Some speakers had treated the subject as though it was desired to banish the English language from Ireland. No such proposition or suggestion had been made. It was a gross misrepresentation to pretend to the English people that that was the object of the movement. It was essential that the Irish people should be able to speak the language spoken on the great continent of America among that friendly, free, and sympathetic people. It was also necessary that they should know the English tongue when they went to the great new Commonwealth which had just been constituted and formed by the people of Australia. It was, therefore, absurd to make the suggestion to which he had referred. No harm would be done to any English interest; England would lose nothing by it. Whatever concession the Government might make, the Irish people were determined to keep this subject going until their object was attained. It was not necessary for him to argue the matter further, but he felt bound to let his voice be heard on the subject, as otherwise he would feel he had not done his duty. The speech of the Chief Secretary had been sympathetic, and if he would pluck up heart and go a little further, he would win for himself a grateful and kindly feeling on the part of the Irish people. The nation meant to alter the condition of things under which numbers of Irish people never heard a word of Irish in their lives, and every word of sympathy and help in that struggle would be repaid with affectionate and friendly feeling by the people of Ireland.

MR. DALY (Monaghan, S.) said the directions he had received during the last few days were to the effect that the people of his constituency were anxious that the Government should introduce the teaching of the Irish language into the schools. To his own knowledge, in the district where he came from, in which English only was spoken, he could assure the Committee that there were a great number of classes where Irish was being taught. He was rather disappointed with the reply of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary, for he had always been under the impression that the right hon. Gentleman was accountable for the entire government of Ireland. If any hon. Member put a question in the House about education they would put it to the Chief Secretary. The Chief Secretary had stated that he had no power over the Education Board, and yet he answered for them in this House. Such an argument was entirely inconsistent with the office which the Chief Secretary held. Therefore he was greatly surprised at the statement which had been made, for the right hon. Gentleman had tried to place the entire blame upon the shoulders of the managers of the schools. If a manager of a school in Ireland wanted a teacher who could teach Irish, where was he to get that teacher? There were no training colleges to teach them, and if a teacher were appointed who understood Irish probably an inspector would be sent from this country to award marks for the teaching of a subject about which he knew absolutely nothing. It was a very remarkable fact that, in the west of Ireland, where the Irish language was so largely spoken, out of 1,300 schools no less than 1,164 of them were anxious that Irish should be taught in those schools. Could there be anything more conclusive than that fact?

The right hon. Gentleman had been met by arguments from the Irish Members which could not be controverted. The speech of Dr. Starkie, the new Resident Commissioner, had been placed before the Committee. The Chief Secretary had just made a speech, and he scarcely knew whether the right hon. Gentleman was for or against their demands. He stated that he had no power with the Commissioners of National Education, and yet he had to answer for them in the House of Commons. All the same, he believed that if the right hon. Gentleman stated to the Commissioners for National Education that it was his wish that they should introduce the teaching of the Irish language in Irish-speaking districts, that statement would take away a great deal of the soreness of the Irish people upon this question. It was very remarkable that while the Irish people could not get permission to have their own language taught in their own schools, the Welsh people obtained that concession long ago. There were only about 2,000 Jews in Ireland, and yet their language was fostered and allowed to be taught. The Jews were allowed this privilege, and yet the Irish were not. This was another Irish grievance which had been put forward so often in this House with the same inevitable result. The Chief Secretary said that there was no desire on behalf of the Irish people to have their children taught the home language, but he was quite wrong. There was a convent where he came from where the children were sent to be educated, and one of the subjects taught there was Irish. He knew that thirty-five young ladies from that convent competed at the intermediate examinations last year. Those children came from the most respectable class of people in Ireland, and if the parents of those children were not anxious that their children should learn their native language, was it likely that they would send them to schools where Irish was taught? This was a very strong argument, showing that Irish parents of the most respectable class were anxious that their children should understand and be able to converse in the tongue which the British Government had done so much to remove and stamp out in Ireland. The Commissioners of Education had put in kindergarten, singing, and other matters to be taught, but the Irish language was not there. Although the right hon. Gentleman had stated he had no power over the Commissioners, he believed that if the Chief Secretary only gave that body a hint they would not be very long before they acted upon it, and he was sure that by so doing he would earn the gratitude of the Irish people. It was not the slightest use delaying this matter, because the Irish language would have to be taught in the Irish schools. The people of Ireland were determined to know their native tongue, and the right hon. Gentleman might as well at once give the Commissioners instruction to do something which would eventually have to be done.

MR. J. F. X. O'BRIEN (Cork): Whilst listening to the sympathetic speech made by the right hon. Gentleman, for some time I could not tell whether he was for or against us, but when he denied responsibility for the policy of the Education Board in Ireland that satisfied me that he was not to be trusted in the matter. When the Chief Secretary denies responsibility for men whom he has himself appointed I decline to accept his denial of responsibility. What has the right hon. Gentleman done to remove this disability? I certainly have seen no action at all on his part in this direction beyond a few words of sympathy, which, as far as we are concerned, means nothing at all. We intend to test the genuineness of the sympathy of the Chief Secretary upon this question. We want him to carry out the same system which has already been granted to Wales. I feel it my duty to state that I believe there is a conspiracy existing between him and the Education Board against our native language. If the right hon. Gentleman means to put himself right with the Irish people let him tell us plainly that he means to carry out in Ireland the bilingual system which is already in operation in Wales.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): There are a couple of points which, to my mind, have not yet been advanced in this debate. This is the only opportunity afforded us in this House on the Estimates of criticising the action of the

National Board of Education. It has always been a puzzle to me why certain gentlemen are called the National Board, because I have always regarded them as an anti-Irish Board, and I think even the dual occupants of the Treasury Bench this evening can hardly contradict that statement. It is because they are anti-Irish that they have this extraordinary objection to the teaching of the Irish language. Any literary man who has studied this subject must know perfectly well that a language is distinctly a part of the nation, and a great scholar once said that the nation which loses its language loses the best part of its existence. If that is true of other nations I can hardly understand why it should not be applied also to Ireland. To my mind, that is precisely the reason why the National Board of Education do not desire to teach the Irish language in Ireland. I have had some experience in this matter, although I do not pretend to be a profound Irish scholar. I have spent some time in Connemara, and I know that the children who used to attend the schools there were only taught English, and the Irish language was discouraged as far as possible. Not only this, but it was made absolutely penal to speak the Irish language. That was an absolute fact. I was told it by hundreds of people in Connemara, and in that district there was actually a penal law against speaking the language of the people. I challenge any hon. Member to contest my statement and to inquire whether such a thing ever took place in Connemara. I regret to find that these old bad traditions are apparently still a working factor in the minds of the National Board of Education. I would appeal to hon. Gentlemen opposite whether we have not arrived at a different stage of civilisation, when we ought to be more in accord with the spirit of the times, and when we ought not to revert to the old bad system of coercion. What is the *raison d'être* of constitutional government? It is that it should be administered in the spirit of the community it governs. We have now a manifestation all over the country in the shape of a Gaelic revival, and it is one of the most vaunted of constitutional maxims that public opinion ought to be the breath of the law. But in this matter the spirit of the law is absolutely opposed to popular opinion. Why do I say that? Only last night an enormous meeting was held in the Round Room or Rotunda—the largest hall in Dublin. It was a public protest on this very question. I received an invitation to attend, but was obliged to decline it because I had to come to the House of Commons. Cardinal Logue wrote a letter which was read at that meeting, and letters were read from other public men, and a resolution was passed calling on the Irish Members of Parliament to resist the proposals of the Commissioners until they had been amended by making provision for bilingual education in Ireland as in Wales. There is a manifestation of public opinion in Ireland, and here to-night we have the Chief Secretary telling us that he has no control whatever over the so-called National Board of Education, and that even the House of Commons has no power, although the taxpayers of Ireland provide the funds whereby education is carried out. That would not be allowed to exist in any other constitutionally governed country in the world. If the Chief Secretary wants philosophic, educational, or literary reasons why the bilingual system should be adopted in Ireland, he will find them in a short practical pamphlet issued by the Gaelic League. I have been requested by the branch of the League to which I belong to speak in this debate. The other evening we had a meeting in the town hall of Blackrock. I was in the chair, and the enthusiasm evinced at the meeting was something extraordinary. The right hon. Gentleman may tell us that there is no spirit among the people as regards this movement, but in Blackrock the urban district council—formerly a Conservative body, but which has lately assumed a Nationalist complexion—has put the names of the streets in Gaelic, so that we are Irish still, notwithstanding the efforts of the National Board; and it seems to me that if the right hon. Gentlemen on the Treasury Bench would approach this question in a philosophic spirit, they would recognise that fact. I want to argue this question not from an extreme Nationalist point of view, but from an educational, practical, common-sense point of view. I would put this to the right hon. Gentleman: is it a wise thing to provoke friction between the people and the National Education Board, when there ought to

be co-operation in the fullest sense of the word? That is not a proposition that will be contradicted even by those who hold the opposite view on this question. Our people are very much in earnest, and unless the demand of the Irish Members is assented to the attendance in the schools may possibly be reduced, which would be an unmixed evil. I have always been in favour of carrying out the clause for compulsory attendance at schools, because, unless the children attend school regularly, there cannot be any educational progress in the country. Some hon. Members opposite—possibly the Chief Secretary, and undoubtedly the majority of the National Board—think this is a sentimental question. Granted that it is. But you want the children to attend school, and anything that would bring about friction and lessen the school attendance would be nothing less than a national evil. In conclusion, I will only say that the National Board—which is a nominated Board, which does not represent the people, and which is out of touch with popular opinion—is the worst body you could have to carry out what is called national education, and if the Chief Secretary declares in this House that he is unable to control the Board, then I think it is time it was brought under the control of somebody. Mr. Butt once declared that the worst system of government was government by irresponsible nominated Boards, and I think this Board of Education ought to be elected, or at any rate responsible to the elected representatives of the people. There can be no question of such importance to the community at large as the question of education, and yet in Ireland we put the whole management of the education of the country into the hands of seven gentlemen who are responsible to nobody, and over whom the taxpayers have no control whatever, and who have chosen by their unwise action to introduce friction between the people of Ireland and the system of education in that country. I hope the arguments I have advanced will be considered by the right hon. Gentleman. I have endeavoured to put them forward in a reasonable way, and without introducing any extreme political tinge, because I think this is a matter we ought to approach in a calm spirit of consideration, for there is nothing more important to a community than its system of education.

*SERJEANT HEMPHILL (Tyrone, N.): I am not satisfied with merely giving a silent vote on this motion. Speaking as the representative of an Irish constituency and also as an Irish Protestant, I wish to express my entire agreement with most of the arguments I have heard from below the gangway. It seems to me that neither of the right hon. Gentlemen who spoke from the Treasury bench treated the question in a very ingenuous manner, for while both of them expressed strong sympathy with the general object of the motion, they each endeavoured as it were to divert the mind of the Committee from what the real issue is. The Chief Secretary endeavoured to convert this question as to the teaching of Irish in National schools in Ireland into a question of far greater and wider application. I do not understand that the object of this motion is to substitute Irish for English as the spoken language of the Irish people. That is a much larger question which can be dealt with if ever it arises. The question we have to consider to-night is the Vote for the National Education Board. The right hon. Gentleman while expressing sympathy with the object of the motion tried to shirk all responsibility and to throw it on the National Board. I am not going to say one word with reference to the component members of the Board. For many of them individually I have the highest respect, but the fact that Protestants and Catholics are equally balanced on it indicates to me that it is a Board not for the purpose of considering what is best in order to promote the education of the country, but what is best to enable the balance to be maintained without any great outrage to either side. It is quite a fallacy to say that the Government or this House has no control over the National Board. But the House of Commons has to vote the money for the Board, and on this motion the House of Commons have to take the responsibility of deciding on which side the merits of the question rest. Therefore it is vain for the right hon. Gentleman to say in one breath that he is quite in accord with Irish Members below the gangway, and then in another

breath that he is utterly powerless to further his own view. I also think that the Vice-President of the Board of Agriculture was not very ingenuous, because he seemed to convey to the Committee that the Board of Education in their new rules had initiated something which was in the direction aimed at by this motion. In that he was quite under a mistake, because the insignificant note to which he referred is merely the repetition of a note which has appeared in the rules of the National Board since 1883. What then becomes of the entire argument of the right hon. Gentleman the Vice-President of the Board of Agriculture? He endeavoured to smooth down the hon. Members below the Gangway—which is not very easy to do—by stating that the National Board had initiated a new rule which would probably lead to what was desired by hon. Members, but he must not have been aware that that was a mere repetition of a note which for seventeen years has appeared in the Code, and which has led not to the promotion but to the gradual extinction of the teaching of the Irish language in the National schools. What is the real issue? It is not the absurd idea that at the end of the nineteenth century the 4,500,000 inhabitants of Ireland should at once begin to learn Irish, and that all our business and all our litigation should in future be carried on in Irish. That is not the intention of any rational man. The object and intention is to teach the rising generation Irish, and through Irish to teach them English, and to educate their minds in order to fit them for the struggle of life. That is the question at issue, and also whether it is to be done in the manner which is commended by the hierarchy of Ireland and by 1,200 managers of schools and which was voiced at the meeting at the Rotunda last evening. What could be more reasonable? The demand is that in all places where Irish is the home language pupils should be taught to read and write it, and that other useful subjects should be imparted to them through the medium of Irish. It appears that the number of Irish-speaking people in Ireland is at present 630,000, who reside principally in the West, within a line drawn from Donegal —whose claims have been so eloquently expressed by one of its representatives to-night—down to Waterford, and the question is whether in these districts every facility should not be given to the young people to be taught through the medium of Irish. I recollect once when travelling in Kerry I stopped at the village of Sneem. I went into the National school, and on one side were drawn up about forty little boys, their bright black eyes and dark hair rendering their nationality unmistakable. On the opposite side was an equal number of boys not quite so dark. I asked the teacher what it meant. "Oh," he said, "these boys to the left can only speak Irish, and those to the right can speak English, and my plan is to teach the Irish-speaking boys through Irish, and also to endeavour to teach the English-speaking boys some knowledge of the Irish language." That is the style of thing I would like to see prevailing in all National schools in Irish-speaking districts. What a lamentable thing it would be if the Irish language, for want of encouragement, was really to become a dead language! The language of every country is an historic asset, and how sad and lamentable it would be if, through the neglect of the Government of the country, a language which by common consent and tradition embodies in itself poetry and matters of historical interest, were to be wholly lost. If that language were to become a dead language where it is now the language of nearly a million of people, what responsibility would rest not merely on the Government, but on the representatives of that people! I think we are bound to use every exertion to keep alive that language. What would we not give to have languages which are dead revived again! What would we not give if the great Latin language were a spoken and written language again! What would we not give if the language of the magnificent sublimity of Socrates and Homer were alive again! Anyone who does not try to arrest the decay of a language is in my opinion guilty of a great historical crime. We seek, therefore, that the National Board should be compelled to make this change, and that English should be taught in Irish-speaking districts through the medium of Irish. Is not that the obvious way to teach the youth in these districts? If you want to teach an Irish boy English you

Serjeant Hemphill.

must teach him through a language he understands and in which he thinks. Otherwise he will only learn English like a parrot, by rote. In old libraries are to be found Latin grammars in which not only the grammatical part but also the explanatory part is in Latin. That idea is exploded now, because it was found to be such an enormously difficult way of teaching the language. Now, in all Latin and Greek grammars the explanatory part is in English, and the grammatical part in the language which it is sought to teach. For the Irish-speaking districts the grammatical part of an English grammar should be in English and the explanatory part should be in Irish. It is vain and absurd to try to relieve the National Board from responsibility on the ground that they cannot get teachers to teach Irish. I deny that altogether. We know that in everything—educational as well as commercial — the demand always creates the supply. Do not tell me you cannot get plenty of Irish teachers. In fact, in my boyhood days there were several what were called "hedge-schoolmasters" in Tipperary. I remember myself learning the Lord's Prayer in Irish, which was, I suppose, what made me such a good Christian. When I heard the eloquent speech of the hon. Member for the Flint Boroughs, to whom we all are indebted, I had in my recollection an old teacher who endeavoured, when I was very small indeed, to instil into me a knowledge of the Irish language, and if I had had the opportunity afterwards I am not at all sure that I would not have been able to orate much better in that language than I can ever hope to do in English. Then the other part of the demand is equally reasonable—namely, that a knowledge of the Irish language should be made a necessary subject of examination, and put at least on a level with the dead languages. I am a great admirer of the dead languages. I studied them very much, and I would not give up my knowledge of them for any earthly acquisition. Many people find great difficulty in learning Latin or Greek, but give a young Irishman an opportunity of learning the language of his own country, of reading the legends of his own country, full of heroism, and full of that spirit which still breathes in the pages of immortal Homer, and you will not only elevate his character, but make him a better citizen than he is at present.

MR. DILLON: This has been an extremely interesting debate, and for more reasons than one. For myself it has been exceedingly interesting because it affirms a prophecy I made two or three years ago in this House, when we listened to a less sympathetic speech from the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary—a prophecy that this was a genuine national movement, and would spread. It has spread and increased in strength so largely that he will find it a more popular movement than he even now seems to think. I desire to say in regard to the speech delivered to-night by the right hon. Gentleman, that, although he undoubtedly exhibited considerable sympathy with the cause we advocate, he minimised and underrated the importance of the question. He commenced by finding fault with the hon. Member for Waterford because the hon. Gentleman spoke of this question as involving the whole future of the Irish race in its higher and spiritual sense. Now, I think that language is justified, and that the considerations involved do seriously affect the whole future of the Irish race. Although the right hon. Gentleman has shown a considerable advance on the subject to-night—and I recognise the sympathetic tone of his speech—I think he has still failed to understand and appreciate the full bearing of this question, and the value placed upon it by those who are advocating it in Ireland. This is a question which is not at all exhausted when we deal with the considerations as to teaching the children in Irish-speaking districts the use of their own tongue, and instructing them in the English language and various subjects of education through the medium of their own tongue. That is a pressing and urgent question; but it is small compared with the great subject of the value of the language itself, and all that is contained in it, to the spiritual condition of the Irish people. Before dealing with the more practical part of the question, I desire to say that I hold diametrically opposite views from those expressed by the hon. Member for East Down. He thinks that in encouraging the Irish language we are engaged in a foolish and mischievous task, and he gave us the

reasons for that opinion. First of all, he laid down the doctrine that the value of a language was to be estimated by the number of people who spoke it, and that without any qualification whatever. And he went on to say that if a language was spoken by few people it was practically valueless. I would point out that by that canon of criticism Chinese is by far the most valuable language spoken by the human race. See where that proposition carries us! If the value of a language is to be estimated by the number of people who speak it, then the Greek language is the most valueless, because the number of people who spoke the language of Homer never exceeded two or three millions. According to the hon. Gentleman's argument the Greek language was contemptible, and ought to have been wiped out in favour of the Persian language. To come to the Latin language, which spread all over Europe and some parts of Asia, the same argument could have been used with even greater force in the days of the supremacy of the Empire of Rome in favour of the obliteration of the language of Greece, because the latter was only spoken by a despised, an insignificant, and a conquered nation. And yet that language and literature have carried down the stream of time the most precious portions of our civilisation. They remain, and will not be dislodged even by the hon. Member for East Down. We are more indebted to the spiritual power of the language and literature of that little conquered people of Greece than to the great Empire of Rome itself. I need not point to the history of the Hebrew race. According to the argument of the hon. Member for East Down, the Bible and the language of the Hebrews, who were a conquered race, would come under the same law as the language and literature of the Greeks. The fact is that the whole course of history shows us that the greatest spiritual lessons of mankind and the greatest literatures have sprung from small peoples and from languages spoken by a comparatively insignificant portion of the human race; and that there is no comparison between the value of a language and the number of people who speak it. Therefore there is no force in that argument. The hon. Gentleman, and I must say to some extent others who have spoken from the Government Benches, seem to think that they have settled this question when they look upon it from a purely utilitarian point of view. But I utterly repudiate that criterion of judgment. I say that while it is perfectly legitimate to argue this question from a utilitarian point of view, you cannot exhaust it and arrive at a proper judgment from that single standpoint. The hon. Gentleman opposite talks about trade, and says that no language is of value except English, then Chinese, and next German or French. [An HON. MEMBER: No.] I understood him to say that Chinese was one of the most important languages if we are to be guided by the amount of trade. But that is a principle which we cannot and do not accept. We base our demand for the preservation of, and fair play being given to, the ancient language of our people on higher considerations than mere utilitarianism. We hold that we have a right to reinstate the Irish language and literature in the place of honour from which they were driven in the days of conquest and persecution; because we believe that if you interrupt the intellectual life of the people, if you tear them out by the roots, as it were, and plant them down in the midst of an alien civilisation, and of a race with whose traditions and history they are unacquainted and entirely out of sympathy, you will effectually dwarf their intellectual growth and injure the moral fibre of the entire race. Viewed from that point, the subject is one of infinitely greater importance and deeper and more philosophic weight than the right hon. Gentleman seems to recognise. What is the history of the Irish language? Down to the time of the famine the Irish language was the habitual speech of the south and west of Ireland, and, although I do not believe in any of the figures on the subject taken at that time, at least three millions of the people of Ireland used the Irish tongue as the habitual means of social and commercial communication. All the small gentry in the part of the country I come from spoke no other language. At that time there was a great movement in Ireland to revive the literature and songs and music of Ireland, and there were in Dublin scholars who from their various acquirements could bear comparison with those of any other country in Europe—Currie, O'Sullivan,

O'Kelly, and others, who have hardly left a successor. These men, had they lived in a normal condition of things, would have been founders of schools, and I venture to say that had it not been for the famine and the vile persecution to which the language and literature of Ireland were subjected, these Irish scholars would have now held as high a position in the learning of Europe as any of the great scholars who now stand in the forefront of philological learning and folk-lore. But what happened? The National movement was more or less identified with the study of the language, folk-lore and music of Ireland; and the whole of the men then engaged in Irish studies were isolated, divorced from support, and viewed with evil suspicion by the Irish Government. The great seats of learning in Ireland discouraged Irish scholarship and started a crusade of the most atrocious character against the Irish leaders. That is a part, and a most vital part of this question, and I could undertake to show that all the great seats of learning in Ireland, including Trinity College, boycotted Irish learning and Irish scholars, so that to become an Irish scholar was synonymous with starvation. And so the last great race of Irish scholars died in a state of the most miserable poverty—a scandal and a disgrace to the Government of the day and to the seats of learning. What was the consequence? In the days when we were young we could not learn Irish; there was no opportunity for doing so; and those who took any interest in the subject were condemned to the cruel humiliation of seeing the whole traditions of Irish scholarship pass away to Germany and France. To-day's *Times* newspaper is filled with admiration at a German coming over to Ireland and publishing a great work on the Irish language, and it goes on to say that "more had been done for Celtic studies by a few German scholars from the time of Zeuss down to the present day than by all the vain chattering of Irish literary societies." That only exhibits the gross and savage ignorance of the *Times* in regard to the Irish language and literature; and I venture to say that if Zeuss had been living to-day he would have been the first to condemn that insult to Irish scholarship. Zeuss did, no doubt, a great deal, but nothing compared with O'Kelly, O'Sullivan, and others, who, had they lived in Germany or France, would have been honoured, and their lives made comfortable; but because they lived in Ireland, and were Irishmen, were starved and made scarecrows of, to prevent other Irishmen following in their steps. When the right hon. Gentleman, I am sure without the intention of inflicting pain upon us, pointed to the fact that Irish was an unpopular subject of study in the higher colleges and universities of Ireland, he forgot why that was. It was because to be an Irish student, an Irish scholar, was enough to shut to a man every avenue of success in Ireland, and because, owing—to its shame be it said—to the bigotry of Trinity College, which has in its library some of the finest monuments of Irish literature and art in the world, and of the other great learned bodies in Ireland, and to the persecution of the Government, Irish scholars of a past generation, giants as they were, were condemned to poverty and misery, and had to trust for their living to a few private patrons. That is the reason why Irish is not a popular study in the great seats of learning in Ireland. That is the A B C of this question, without which all that is involved in it cannot be understood. The language and literature of Ireland—which, by the admission of the greatest European scholars, is the richest, most valuable, and most varied of all Celtic languages and literatures—has been, down to our time, subjected to a persecution unparalleled in the history of our race. They have been banished from our universities, banned in our intermediate colleges and schools, and proscribed in the primary schools. That policy was the idea of the Government of the day. It was alleged that the study of the antiquities and history of Ireland was calculated to foster the national spirit, and they banned them both. That is the full explanation of why there should exist a certain lack of popularity, as has been the phrase, for Irish studies in the higher seats of learning. But in these modern times a new movement has sprung up. Like many other movements, it has sprung up from the people themselves. When the language was banned by all the great and wealthy societies like Trinity College, and outlawed by the Government, these associations sprang up among the people themselves,

and commenced, in a small way for many years, to try and bring the language and literature of Ireland to the front. When I was a student I was one of the very first to form the old Society for the Preservation of the Irish Language. We did not make much progress to start with, and received absolutely no encouragement from the Government or the seats of learning. But the movement has grown and has been taken up afresh by the Gaelic League, who have aroused the strength of the Irish people in favour of their own tongue and literature. I congratulate that league on the success of their work, because it is due to them that this debate has been so prolonged, and that it has been supported by the vast majority of the Irish Members. When the right hon. Gentleman came to the practical bearing of this question he said he was in sympathy with the Gaelic League as regards their first claim—that in Irish-speaking districts Irish should be used in teaching English; but he said he had no power. I was acquainted with that. I knew that the National Board of Education was perfectly independent, except that the Lord Lieutenant may refuse to sanction new rules. That is the extraordinary thing. I do not know if in the whole civilised globe you can point to a body of men who have control over the education of the country, and for whom a Vote of £12,000 a year is passed, but over whom Parliament has absolutely no power. The Minister of Education in this country has control over the sums voted by Parliament, and is responsible to the people; but it is not so in Ireland. What are we to do? The most irrational thing would seem to be to endeavour to cut off a small portion of the provision for public education in Ireland, and I point out the absurdity of that. The Government deal in all kinds of absurd devices to dodge round the difficulties of the situation; but if the Government were to get the Irish Members together in Grand Committee we could settle all these matters from year to year. The reason why these matters are so perniciously arranged is that the views are consulted of High Churchmen in England, Nonconformists, and other people who do not know the facts of Ireland. That is what has destroyed Irish education, and has rendered it impossible for us to get the education of Ireland on a sound basis. To show the extreme vitality of the old language, a Danish professor, who went down to the west of Ireland a year ago, and lived among the people to study the old language, records this most remarkable fact. He went down and lived among the peasantry of Arran, and he says after living there for a short time he was able to write down 4,000 words "which I have heard them use in their every-day life." I venture to say that if any gentleman interested in linguistic studies goes down to Somerset or Kent he will not find 500 words used by the people in daily conversation. Yet in Ireland this gentleman asserts he put down 4,000 words. What do you substitute when you go teaching the English and banning the Irish language? You give them a vocabulary of 200 or 300 English words, with the meaning of which they are not acquainted, and is it any wonder that you make them stupid? You first reduce the vocabulary enormously, and the vocabulary you give them is not understood by the people who speak it. I only allude to that to show how enormously important the question is with regard to the intellectual equipment of these Irish-speaking peasants. The truth is that there has been a deliberate attempt to destroy the Irish language. The result is to keep these children in a state of ignorance and stupor, and we have to sit here night after night and year after year and listen to the taunts which are levelled at the illiteracy of our people, who have been kept illiterate by the State policy, and largely by this infamous campaign against their native tongue. This system has again and again been condemned by Government officials, but still the studied, dogged policy of the Board has been to ban the Irish language, and that has been carried on by successive Boards, supported by successive Chief Secretaries. It seems to be desirable to right it, but how is it to be carried further? We do not know. The Chief Secretary has no power and the Board refuses to move. I have no hesitation in characterising that as adding insult to injury. The right hon. Gentleman will admit that it is desirable to point out his own powers in the matter. I notice that he always seems to enlarge upon the difficulties. First of all, he made out that there was a difficulty in getting teachers. I am not surprised that

there is after what I have described. Knowledge of Irish has been made the badge of inferiority and the object of oppression. How could there be a supply of teachers? There is no room for the study of the Irish language in the training colleges. It has not been encouraged in any way. It has always been given the cold shoulder, and how can you expect to get teachers when in the training colleges the subject is banned? It is nothing short of an outrage that at the training colleges of the State the Irish tongue should be completely ignored. The Gaelic League have displayed admirable activity in pushing this question as they have done. I am informed that there are 250 teachers who are conversant with the Irish tongue, but they get no engagements. But why are steps not taken to teach the Irish language in the training colleges? If it was made a subject ranking with the teachers among other subjects, would not the demand of a certainty create the supply in a short time? Does the right hon. Gentleman forget the memorial of the managers, representing well over 1,000 schools? As I understand the programme at present, there is no room for teaching Irish. What is the use of managers making provision for teachers of the Irish language if the Irish colleges have thrown it out? There is really no footing in the Irish schools for the Irish language, and I do not see how there could be a supply of teachers if the subject is not put upon a level with other subjects. We know perfectly well that in the Education Code the subjects that are to be taught are carefully set forth, and that Irish is put into the background, and that until quite recently, when some slight change was made, there was no encouragement. Therefore it is not fair to cast upon the managers the blame for a state of things which is the outcome of a long, continuous, and deliberate conspiracy to put the Irish language down. But there will be no fault hereafter if the teachers are forthcoming. I now turn for a moment to the question of the second demand of the Gaelic League. I think there is a good deal of vagueness in the nature of this second demand. The right hon. Gentleman said he took the second demand to imply that Irish should be made compulsory in all schools whether parents liked it or not. I do not think the matter is placed so high as that, nor have I ever gone so far. I think it would be an absurd thing; but, of course, in all movements like this there are enthusiasts. I know that there are persons in Ireland, with whom I differ, who suggest that we should take to the Irish and abandon the English tongue altogether. I do not go that length, nor do I believe that any great body of the people would agree to enforce Irish upon unwilling people. I would never be a party to it, and it has never been put forward. Neither of these reforms would be forced upon the schools; they would be introduced at the discretion of the managers. It is not to be supposed that a manager would force upon an unwilling school a subject that was distasteful to the people. As I understand it, it is a claim to restore the native language to a place of honour in all schools in Ireland, and I tell the right hon. Gentleman and the Board of Education, that, unless I am greatly mistaken, there never will be peace in Ireland until that is done. I conclude with the statement that my deep conviction is that until Irish language and Irish literature are raised to a position of equality with other subjects, in all the primary and secondary schools of Ireland, this agitation will never cease. We do not want to enforce it on any unwilling body of men, but we do insist, and we shall continue to until we succeed, upon the fact that the language and literature of our country shall occupy a position of honour in the primary and secondary schools and university colleges in Ireland. We want a university where Irish shall occupy a place of honour. We ask that the scarcity of teachers shall be met by the study of Irish literature and the Irish tongue, which shall lead on to chairs and fellowships, so that the students may have an opportunity of living; because students cannot live on suction, and if you tell a young man in Ireland that if he devotes himself to the study of Irish he must starve, you pursue a policy of proscription and persecution, which is a policy which we will never sit quietly under. We do not wish to attempt the impossible task of banishing the English tongue from Ireland, and depriving ourselves of the advantage of speaking that tongue, but we do insist upon the right of those who teach the Irish tongue being placed upon an

equality with the teachers of other subjects, and we insist and demand that Irish scholarship in the future shall not be treated as it has been in the past as a badge of inferiority and contempt; but, on the contrary, that the Irish language and literature of the country shall be so treated that men may devote their lives and labours to that study, without having their footsteps dogged as the footsteps of Sheridan and O'Connell were dogged by the spectre of starvation.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland) expressed satisfaction at the fact that the hon. Member for East Mayo disclaimed the extravagances which no doubt would cast some little ridicule upon this movement, and had not added to its strength. Irishmen could not be asked to give up speaking the English language and separate themselves from the great civilisation of the world which it represented. That was the most grotesque proposal that could be contemplated, and it had brought many persons to doubt the sincerity and reality of the movement in favour of the Irish language. Neither did he look forward to the production among present-day literature of a work in the Irish language; but for all that he maintained that there was reality and reason behind this movement. There were instances in the present century of a language almost dead having been revived, notably in the case of the Zcech language in Bohemia. So that the proposal to revive the Irish language was not without precedent. He was old enough to have seen a very great change in Ireland. He remembered in his childhood when the Irish tongue was a great deal more spoken than it was to-day. In this connection he had a very curious experience in California. While in California he was the guest in, Los Angelos, of a gentleman born not far from Athlone. This gentleman described how when a boy he saw a youth wandering through the market place in Athlone, but no one who met the boy understood a word he said, and whether he dropped from Heaven or came from some other region was a matter of doubt. This gentleman went up to him and found that the strange tongue was the Irish language. That would show how the native language had died away in Ireland. While in Boston he was presented with an address, he thought in poetry, but he candidly confessed that he did not understand a word of it, because it was in the Irish tongue. The curious thing, however, was that some of the gentlemen who read the address to him and who composed it were men of Irish descent who had never been in Ireland. He also heard a lecture on the Irish language at the Royal Irish Academy by a German philologist—a most interesting lecture—and in recent years some of the highest authorities on the Irish tongue had been men of German birth. He was familiar with the bread-and-butter argument, which he did not entirely disclaim, but he recalled the labours of Professor Max Müller and the statement that the whole science of philology had been revolutionised by the discovery of Sanscrit, which was of still less bread-and-butter value than Irish. He wondered if the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary had read the essay of the Professor on the science of language. He understood that Sanscrit remained the ancient classical language of India, the value of which was not only as a key to the Indian languages of to-day, but also as the great link which bound together the Aryan languages of Europe and the Semitic languages of the East. Sanscrit played an important part in the study of philology, which was one of the greatest and finest of the new sciences of the age, and in the same way the right of the Irish language to survive and to be encouraged might be based alone on philological grounds. His hon. friend the Member for the Flint Boroughs had spoken of how his knowledge of Welsh enabled him to reach the inner hearts and minds of the Breton people. He might shew how the Irish language could act as a sort of rough interpreter between people of different nationalities. He met a gentleman in Los Angelos who left Ireland when quite a boy. He heard a fragment of conversation that passed between that gentleman and a shepherd who was tending sheep outside of Los Angelos. The shepherd spoke Basque, and that was another of the great Celtic family of languages. His friend was able to carry on a certain amount of conversation with that Basque shepherd from the north of Spain. The renaissance in connection with these languages was headed by

some of the keenest and greatest intellects of the present day. There was one famous person, a Breton writer, who, although one of the greatest living masters of French prose, did everything in his power to encourage the Celtic revival among the Breton people. His hon. friend had not in the least exaggerated the depreciation and discouragement with which certain studies were visited between 1860 and 1870 in Ireland in Queen's College, Galway. The whole spirit of that unhappy period in Irish history was against the study of Irish. He was not without hope that this debate would bear good fruit, and he would like to impress on the Chief Secretary the fact that it was not enough for him to take up a position of neutrality on this question. The Irish language had been so discouraged and looked down upon that something like a serious effort was required to bring it back to its just and proper place in the education of Ireland. Coming to the second, and, to some extent, the more important branch of the question—the part which the study of Irish took in the education of Irish children in English as well as in Irish—he said the Chief Secretary had recognised that in the bilingual regions the study of English would be very much facilitated by the use of Irish as a medium. There was some striking testimony on that point, some of which had already been quoted. He understood that the Member for Waterford had quoted the remarkable speech of Dr. Starkie, and therefore he need not repeat it. There was passage after passage to prove that the result of trying to teach Irish-speaking children English through an English-speaking teacher was that the unfortunate pupils forgot Irish, and did not learn English, so that really there was a double disadvantage. They deprived the child of anything like a scientific and grammatical knowledge of his mother tongue, and at the same time they did not supply the hiatus by a knowledge of the English tongue. A great deal of stress was attached in that House to the vast amount of illiteracy in Ireland, but the explanation was simple. Taking the three counties where illiteracy was highest—namely, Kerry, Donegal, and Galway—which were also the counties where Irish was still largely spoken, the number of those returned as illiterates and as speaking both languages very closely approached each other. In Kerry the number of people who spoke both Irish and English was 69,701, and the illiterates 58,744. In Galway the number who spoke both languages was 107,029, and the illiterates 87,573. His explanation of this was that the children who went to the schools forgot their Irish while they did not learn English. He believed there were official statements to show that a large number of the best trained educationists of Ireland were of opinion that the want of teaching Irish-speaking children by the Irish medium was largely responsible for the vast and tragical amount of illiteracy in these counties. Thus by the mere fact of their inability to learn English they became illiterate. Apart, therefore, from questions of philology and literature, the teaching of children by the medium of Irish and through an Irish-speaking teacher was an urgent, a vital, and a crying necessity of education in Ireland. The Chief Secretary had urged that the duty of encouraging the study of Irish lay not so much with him as with the managers of schools, and that the managers had not shown as strong a desire in this direction by the engagement of Irish-speaking teachers as might have been expected. If that statement were true the right hon. Gentleman would be entitled to say that he had shifted the responsibility from his own shoulders to that of the managers, and that pressure ought to be brought on the managers of schools to supply Irish-speaking teachers. Was the right hon. Gentleman quite right in his statement of facts? He had before him a terse statement of facts prepared by the president of the Irish League in London. He said that 188 school managers, representing 1,075 schools in Irish-speaking districts, had signed a memorial in favour of the training and sending down of bilingual teachers. The memorial was addressed to the National Board of Education. He understood that, as a rule, a teacher was trained in a training college. If a teacher had a colloquial knowledge of Irish there ought to be the means in the training college of making his colloquial knowledge grammatical and scientific, so that he could go down and teach the children. One of the objections raised on this question was that if they sent a teacher

to a training college to be taught Irish he would be in the same position, because he would be learning Irish as a foreign tongue. That was not the proposal. The proposal was that the teacher sent to the training college should have a colloquial knowledge of Irish, which could be turned into a grammatical and scientific knowledge. He thought they had a right to demand the assistance of the Government not merely on the grounds of science or literature, but by way of meeting a crying evil in the education of Ireland. It would be the duty of the Gaelic Society and of other societies interested in the question to put pressure, wherever and on whomsoever pressure was needed, in order to bring this question to a practical issue, and to give the people of Ireland the same advantages as the people of Wales, and even the Hebrew children dwelling in Ireland, enjoyed at present.

MR. BUTCHER (York) said the hon. Gentleman had spoken of his desire for the increased study of the Celtic language. He ventured to suggest to him that if the Irish language was to be made the subject of study it must be as a matter of higher education in the universities and not in the primary schools. The discussion had turned on two subjects. The first was whether there should be bilingual education—in other words, whether the Irish language should be used in Irish speaking districts as a means of education. The second demand was that Irish should be encouraged as a separate and distinct branch of learning. Upon the first of these questions he was in entire sympathy with hon. Members from Ireland, and he gathered that the Chief Secretary was of the same view. It was quite obvious, from an educational point of view, that if it was desired to impart instruction in English or in anything else to a boy brought up in an Irish-speaking home, it could be done satisfactorily only by addressing him in the language with which he was familiar. He trusted that as the result of the debate effective steps would speedily be taken to carry such a desirable proposal into practice, and that the bilingual system of instruction would be established in those parts which were characterised as chiefly Irish-speaking districts. But when one came to the question whether Irish should be made a separate and distinct branch of study, that was a different matter. It was not so much a sentimental as a practical business question connected with primary education. Was there time to teach Irish as a separate and distinct branch of education? He conceived not. Effective attention could not be given to a second language in addition to the other subjects which it was necessary boys should be taught. But supposing there was time for a second language, the practical question arose whether it should be Irish. With the greatest possible goodwill to the Irish language, he honestly did not think it would be a business-like operation to teach boys in non-Irish-speaking districts the Irish language. If they had the time and talents to acquire a separate language, French or German would be much more useful to them. From that point of view he could not support the contention that Irish should be taught as a separate and distinct branch of learning in the primary schools of Ireland. Reasons had been advanced why the Irish language should be revived, one of those reasons being that the English language was effete, and that it was unfit to express the great, original, and beautiful ideas of the writer of the letter in which this plea was advanced. He wished that that gentleman had been present and heard the speeches of the Irish Members that night: he would not then have been able to complain of the weakness of the English language. When it was said that the English language was effete, and that the language of Shakespeare was not suitable to convey the beautiful and original thoughts of a man, he had some suspicion that it was not so much the language as the thoughts that were at fault. The question really was a purely educational and business one, and when they had the openly-expressed conviction of the Chief Secretary that for educational purposes it was desirable to insist on the bilingual instruction, they had got as far as they were likely to get with advantage. The debate which had taken place would probably do a great deal of good in enabling the Government to insist upon increased efficacy in the bilingual process of instruction, and with that Irish Members should be content, as it was not possible to push the question further in the direction they had indicated with

any advantage, either educationally or commercially, to the people of Ireland.

MR. CREAN (Queen's County, Ossory) complained that Members did not fully realise the demand of the people of Ireland. They did not desire to insist upon Irish being taught to all children; it was to be optional for those attending the schools whether or not they received the instruction. The people had a right to demand the particular studies they wished to have taken up, and the reasonable demand they now made should not be denied. If the English people demanded with the same unanimity as the Irish people had done the encouragement of any particular study, neither the House of Commons nor any Board subordinate to it would dare to withstand that demand for even twenty-four hours. Were the Government going to deny that which would raise the social standing of the Irish people in the world? Why was not a similar course adopted in regard to Scotland and Wales? What reason was there for treating Ireland differently from those two countries? Fifty-seven per cent. of the people on the western seaboard of Ireland were Irish-speaking people, and why should their native tongue be treated in this way? If the House of Commons had not the power to compel the National Board to adopt a different policy in this respect, the sooner a Bill was brought in for the purpose the better. That fossilised Board should be done away with, and a representative Board established which should be responsible to the country, and then the people would be able to get that education which would raise their social and educational standing, and make them what they should be and were before the English nation took them in hand—namely, as intelligent and as educated a people as were to be found in any civilised country on the face of the earth.

DR. TANNER (Cork County, Mid), as representing the district possessing the largest number of Irish-speaking people, supported the demand now being put forward. There were places in county Cork where as many as 92 per cent. of the people were Irish-speaking, and to whom, therefore, this matter was one of very considerable importance. He had again and again come across cases in which the children did not understand what was attempted to be imparted to them by National school teachers who were not versed in the Irish language. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary was supposed to "boss" the National Board, but, apparently, the National Board "bossed" the Chief Secretary. It was merely another case of the tail wagging the dog instead of the dog wagging the tail. The hon. Member for York had urged that French or German, rather than Irish, should be taught in primary schools. But who ever heard of any boy learning French or German systematically, and in such a manner as to be able to speak the language, even in the great public schools of England? The classes in which those languages were supposed to be taught were usually the romping-grounds in which the boys made game of the masters, French or German, as the case might be. It was, therefore, absolutely ridiculous to suggest that French or German could be taught in the National schools. He was surprised that the hon. and learned Member for East Down should run down the teaching of Irish, seeing that he had been at Queen's College, Galway.

MR. RENTOUL said there was a Chair of Celtic at Queen's College, Galway, but there were no students, and the professor ultimately died in the workhouse.

DR. TANNER (continuing) said that Irish was deeply studied in most of the universities in Germany, many of the very best scholars coming from that country, and it was time something should be done in Ireland itself. Was there always to be this vendetta? Was it simply because it was Irish that it was not taught? Was there some malign underhand influence at work? Was the object to crush out the language? If that was the case the purpose would never be achieved, as the movement in favour of this demand was growing day by day. At the present time numbers of people who had never given much attention to this matter were now taking it up heart and soul, and although the right hon. Gentleman might affect to despise the

minority in the House of Commons, he would not be able to despise the aspirations of a united people to preserve their beloved and living language.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): I would not be doing my duty if I did not express my opinion on this subject in company with my colleagues on this side of the House. Two hundred and seventy qualified teachers of Irish are now available in Ireland. But, apart from that, we have a number of the higher classes in Ireland who are qualified to teach Irish. The Gaelic League have done me the honour to elect me one of its vice-presidents. I regret that I was not able in my younger days to learn Irish, but within the last two or three months, I am not ashamed to say, I have received my first lessons in the Celtic language, and many of us wish that such opportunities had been available in the past. It is said that this is a very mischievous movement for labouring men. I know a case of a labouring man who is an honorary member of the Gaelic League, and who, when his day's labour is over, gives his services gratuitously in teaching Irish to the boys and girls of his neighbourhood. I think the time has come when the Government should make some concession in this matter. I do not believe there is a single parish in the county of Kerry in which public meetings have not been held in favour of the bilingual system of education. I believe the discussion to-night will do good yet; and the Irish Members have done their duty nobly in pushing forward the claims of the Gaelic League.

MR. SHEE (Waterford, W.): On very few subjects has there been displayed such intimate knowledge in reference to the question at issue, or with the facts connected with the movement, as has been shown in the course of this debate. The hon. Member for Mid Cork referred to the fact that in his constituency there are 14,000 Irish-speaking people, and claimed that that was a higher number than in any other. Although I represent a constituency in the centre of the south-west of Ireland, the number of Irish-speaking people is double that of Mid Cork.

Dr. Tanner.

DR. TANNER: What I said was that 54 per cent. of my constituents speak Irish.

MR. SHEE: In West Waterford the total population is 35,000, and the number of Irish-speaking people is 28,000, or 75 per cent., and there is a very great desire on the part of all these people to be educated in their own language. I am afraid I cannot coincide in the praise given to the speech of the Chief Secretary. I think a too liberal interpretation has been given to it. As I understand it the right hon. Gentleman is not prepared to concede bilingual teaching, but only to concur in any action of the National Board of Education which will permit the use of Irish in Irish-speaking districts for the purpose of enabling pupils to get a knowledge of English. That is an altogether different thing from a bilingual system of education. The demand is, that not merely shall instruction be given in English through the medium of Irish, but that Irish shall be taught as an independent subject. I believe that the Chief Secretary has not said one word in the direction that he is prepared to encourage the teaching of Irish in the schools as a separate subject; and if that is true it is apparent that a malign influence is at work and a desire to prevent the education of Irish children in their own language. A protest should be made from these benches against the scheme of the Government, and I hope that that protest will be made effective. I have been in the House for five years, and for the first time during that period I have received pressing invitations from my constituents to be in my place during this debate. That is only one of the evidences of the fact that there is a very widespread desire that this subject should be treated as one of importance, and that the Government should, with all the energy at our command, be urged to bring about what we aim at. If the right hon. Gentleman has no power at present to do what we want, he has the whole strength of the Government at his back, and there is nothing to prevent him from enforcing his opinion on the Board by a Bill of one clause. There is no parity between the question of the study of French or German in schools and that of the study of Irish. It is not a question of compelling

any child to learn Irish, or the parents of the children, or the managers of schools, to provide for the study of the Irish language; but simply of enabling the children to be taught in Irish, if they and their parents wish it. I am sorry at the narrow view taken by the right hon. Gentleman, but we have been accustomed to attach too much importance to the allegations of the right hon. Gentleman who represents the Government on these occasions. Although he declared there is no political element in this matter, the right hon. Gentleman takes a very narrow view of it. His view is steely cold, and his attitude cannot be described as sympathetic. I hope the right hon. Gentleman has gained a little education this evening, and that when he addresses the House on this subject again he will be able to adopt a more sympathetic attitude.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 70; Noes, 104. (Division List No. 228.)

AYES.

Abraham, W. (Cork, N. E.)
Ambrose, Robert
Austin, M. (Limerick, W.)
Barlow, John Emmott
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Blake, Edward
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Caldwell, James
Carew, James Laurence
Carvill, Patrick G. Hamilton
Channing, Francis Allston
Clancy, John Joseph
Commins, Andrew
Crean, Eugene
Crilly, Daniel
Curran, Thomas B. (Donegal)
Curran, Thomas (Sligo, S.)
Daly, James
Dalziel, James Henry
Dillon, John
Doogan, P. C.
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William (Dublin)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Fox, Dr. Joseph Francis
Gibney, James
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Griffith, Ellis J.
Hammond, John (Carlow)
Harrington, Timothy
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
Healy, Maurice (Cork)
Healy, Timothy M. (N. Louth)
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Hogan, James Francis
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Lawson, Sir W. (Cumb'land)
Lewis, John Herbert
Macaleese, Daniel
MacDonnell, Dr. M. A. (Qn's Co.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
M'Dermott, Patrick
M'Ghee, Richard
M'Leod, John
Maddison, Fred.
Mandeville, J. Francis
Molloy, Bernard Charles
Murnaghan, George
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, Arthur (Donegal)
O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Kelly, James
O'Malley, William
Parnell, John Howard
Pinkerton, John
Power, Patrick Joseph
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shee, James John
Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)
Sullivan, T. D. (Donegal, W.)
Tanner, Charles Kearns
Tennant, Harold John
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Sir Thomas Esmonde and
Captain Donelan.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (Leeds)
Banbury, Frederick George
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Brodrick, Rt. Hn. St. John
Butcher, John George
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbys.
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Charrington, Spencer
Collings Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Fred. Lucas (Lambeth)
Curzon, Viscount
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Faber, George Denison
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hon. Sir J. (Man.
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitz Wygram, General Sir F.
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Colonel (Lancaster)
Galloway, William Johnson
Gedge, Sydney
Giles, Charles Tyrrell
Goldsworthy, Major-General
Gordon, Hon. John Edward
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, George J. (Sussex)
Graham, Henry Robert
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Hamilton, Rt. Hn. Lord George
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert W.
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton, John (Yorks, N. R.)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. William
Keswick, William
Lawrence, Sir E. Durning-(Corn
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks.)
Lecky, Rt. Hon. Wm. Edw. H.
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewelyn, Sir Dillwyn-(Sw'ns'a
Lowles, John
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Macartney, W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
Maclure, Sir John William
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F

Middlemore, J. Throgmorton
Milward, Colonel Victor
Monckton, Edward Philip
More, Robert J. (Shropshire)
Morgan, Hn. F. (Monmouthsh.
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. A (Deptford)
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath
Nicholson, William Graham
Phillpotts, Captain Arthur
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plunkett, Rt. Hon. Horace C.
Purvis, Robert
Rankin, Sir James
Rentoul, James Alexander
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Russell, T. W. (Tyrone)
Rutherford, John
Saunderson, Rt Hon Col Edw. J.
Sidebotham, J. W. (Cheshire)
Stanley, Hon Arthur (Ormskirk
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Sturt, Hon. Humphrey N.
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Warde, Lt.-Col. C. E. (Kent)
Welby, Lt. Col. A. C. E (Taunt'n
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Wrightson, Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyn ham, George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.

Original Question again proposed.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I think the Committee will agree with me that it would be futile, at this time of the morning, to inaugurate a discussion on the new scheme of primary education in Ireland. Up to the present we have discussed only one point, and the broad scheme has not been discussed at all. We are in an unfortunate position with reference to these new rules. As a matter of fact, we have not yet had them in full. We have had what may be described as a summary of the rules, but even that was only put into our hands a few days ago. I make no accusation against the Irish Government in the matter. I think they desired to give us the information as early as possible, but still we did not receive it as early as we ought to have received it. It has been practically impossible for us to gather opinion in Ireland in reference to this new scheme in the few days that have elapsed since the summary was published, and to imagine that we can usefully initiate a discussion now on the new scheme of primary education in Ireland is absurd. A number of very grave questions arise in connection with the scheme which affect not only the general interests of education in Ireland, but also the position of the National teachers, which we naturally ought to protect, and it would be impossible at this hour to adequately discuss them. I would repeat to the Government a suggestion which was made in connection with the subject of Intermediate education in Ireland yesterday—namely, that ample opportunity should be given to us to discuss this question also. I would make an earnest appeal to the Government to give us an undertaking that we shall have an opportunity of discussing what amounts to a revolution in the system of primary education in Ireland. If we get that undertaking I would be in favour of taking no discussion on the new rules to-night. I do not think we have sufficient information to enable us to usefully discuss them. The discussion could not be reported, and would not give any satisfaction to the classes interested in this subject in Ireland. We are discussing not a political question at all, but a change in the whole primary system of education in Ireland. It is essential that this discussion should be taken under conditions which would render it useful and effective, and I would most earnestly appeal to the Government to give us an assurance that an adequate opportunity will be afforded us to discuss this revolution in the system of primary and intermediate education in Ireland. I would suggest that we ought to adjourn the discussion on the primary education changes, and wait for that adequate opportunity when we will have sufficient information about the changes in our possession to enable us to discuss them reasonably. I have always found that the First Lord of the Treasury has been anxious to take a reasonable view, and, so far as consistent with his position, to meet the convenience of Irish Members. I would press upon him that our claim is reasonable, and might fairly be met. A discussion taken now would necessarily be imperfect, and inevitably followed by further discussion later on. I would put it to him that it would be to the interest of the Irish Members, and of general education in Ireland, to accede to our request.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I had hoped that opportunity might have been found for discussing

what I recognise is a most important question, but I am aware that another topic will occupy the attention of the Committee. I also recognise that possibly this is too early a stage on which to take a useful discussion of the rules, which have not been in operation for any length of time, and are not in the hands of hon. Gentlemen. I have no doubt that when the next session comes round hon. Gentlemen will have the advantage of a more intimate acquaintance with the wording of the rules, and some experience of how these rules have been working. Under these circumstances I admit there is a great deal that is reasonable and impressive in the appeal of the hon Gentleman. I cannot make a definite promise for next session, but I do admit that the subject is of great importance, and one on which hon. Gentlemen from Ireland may well be anxious for an opportunity of expressing their opinion; and I shall be glad to do everything I can, at a more convenient period, to give every facility for that discussion. With that assurance perhaps the hon. Gentleman will now allow us to take the Vote.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: The point is this, that these new rules have to be on the Table for a certain time, and it is within the province of any Member to raise a discussion upon them then. I think that a whole evening might be adequately devoted to the discussion of the new rules on primary and intermediate education. The right hon. Gentleman says he is not in a position to give a definite pledge for next session. Possibly not; the next session may be the first session of a different Parliament. If I understand his statement aright, subject to that limitation, he recognises that my request is a reasonable one, and that such adequate discussion as I have indicated will be granted. If so, I would express myself as satisfied.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: What the hon. Gentleman has asked for is practically that the discussion should occupy a whole night. I will do what I can to prevent the intermediate education rules being discussed at the fag end of the evening. The new rules for primary education would come on in the ordinary course.

Question put, and agreed to.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do now report this Resolution to the House."—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

MR. JOHN REDMOND: There are other Votes on the Paper; and I did not understand that these would not be taken. According to the prevalent idea this is the last occasion on which we will have the Irish Estimates in Committee. But if the right hon. Gentleman is in a position to give us an opportunity to discuss the other Votes on the Paper we might report progress. The next Vote deals with the industrial schools, in which profound interest is taken in Ireland. If the motion to report progress is made I shall oppose it.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It is possible, of course, that some further opportunity might occur before the present session closes. But I do not know that it is very probable, and I cannot hold out any pledge. If the hon. Gentleman desires any further discussion to-night I will meet his wishes; but I am very unwilling to ask the Committee to sit up late.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: It would be better if the right hon. Gentleman could hold out to us some hope that some time would be given before the end of the session to discuss this Industrial School Vote. I do not say that a whole evening should be devoted to it, but if he would give us some opportunity we might adjourn now. It would, however, be better to have some discussion now than none at all.

MR. T. M. HEALY: The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary made a statement early in the session in regard to this Industrial Schools Vote, and I understood that he undertook to look into the matter to see whether some amelioration of the circular in regard to Industrial schools could not be made. We have not had an opportunity of learning his views on the subject. If he could make some statement on the position now we would

be thankful to him, and it may be that it would obviate the necessity of any lengthened discussion.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have no objection to this Vote being taken, provided the discussion is not too long; and therefore I will not now move to report progress.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

CLASS III.

2. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £54,767, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete a sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Expenses of Reformatory and Industrial Schools in Ireland."

MR. T. M. HEALY: The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary has not answered my question. Would he state the result of the inquiry that he promised to make earlier in the session?

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: I do not know exactly what the hon. Gentleman refers to. It is possible that I may have promised at an earlier period of the session that I would look further into the question of whether anything could be done by legislation this session in connection with pauper children. But there has been no opportunity of introducing or even of considering any such legislation.

MR. DILLON: I must say that I am amazed at the statement of the Chief Secretary that his further experience of the working of the circular in regard to the industrial schools has been favourable. All I can say is, that according to the information at our disposal, the experience of those responsible for the industrial schools has been more and more unfavourable in regard to it as time goes on. The history of this transaction will be in the memory of many Members of the House. The whole action of the Chief Secretary has been most singular in this uncalled for interference with a system which was working well—an interference, too, in such a way as to run counter to the unanimous opinion of Ireland, and to upset and threaten with destruction a system which has done an enormous amount of good in Ireland. This circular was issued on 1st October, 1898, and I raised the question in the House for the first time in February, 1899. On that occasion the Chief Secretary referred to the O'Conor Don and some other authorities as inferentially approving of the circular. But he will remember himself that shortly after that debate a most influential deputation, of which the O'Conor Don was a member, waited upon him, and pressed upon him the enormous injury which was being inflicted upon the industrial school system by that circular. The theory of the circular is, that a child in Ireland, before it is admitted into an industrial school must be in some way contaminated. The only information we could extract from the right hon. Gentleman in previous debates as a reason for his extraordinary departure from practice was that certain children were admitted to the industrial schools who would be excluded under a more stringent interpretation of the Act. Mark what was done. For eighteen years the industrial schools system was working in Ireland, and until the right hon. Gentleman came into office it had been the accepted system of the country and had worked untold good. Juvenile crime was almost annihilated by this system and the spirit in which it was worked, and even if the right hon. Gentleman were right in his interpretation, although I think he might be a little more modest, seeing that it was the established practice for eighteen years, he ought to have left well alone. When he was convinced by his legal advisers that the magistrates were giving a rather too liberal interpretation to the Act, he could either have left the system—which he found working admirably—alone, or he could have introduced a one-clause Bill to amend the Act, and bring it into harmony with the system. He, however, issued his circular, the effect of which I will explain to the Committee The right hon. Gentleman endeavoured to make out that the O'Conor Don took

the same view as he did as to the policy and intention of the Act. On Tuesday, 28th November, 1899, a large and representative deputation waited on the Chief Secretary in Dublin, for the purpose of laying their views before him as to the Lord Lieutenant's circular. Amongst those present was the O'Conor Don, and, in the course of a lengthy speech, he said—

"It was he who introduced the Industrial School Bill into the House of Commons in 1867, and succeeded in having it passed into law in 1868. About fifteen years ago a Royal Commission was appointed to inquire into the working of the Act. Every result then known with regard to the working of the Act was made known to that Commission, but fifteen years passed after the Report was made before any change came. Last year a circular was issued which, whatever it was intended to do, had the effect of making a considerable alteration in the administration of the Act. It would be sworn that if the Act was administered in the future as it had been lately the effect would be disastrous among the schools of the country. The intentions of the Act of Parliament were not the interpretations which the magistrates were placing on the circular. He did not hold that the circular forced the interpretation which was being put upon it. They had taken the view that destitution alone was no longer any element for committing to industrial schools, and that they were to inquire into the antecedents of the children, and satisfy themselves that if the children were not sent to school they would fall into crime. That was not the intention of the Act. It was intended also to provide for children who, by the destitution or incapacity of their parents, might fall into crime."

That is the opinion of the O'Conor Don. Mark now what the dispute is. According to the circular, a child must be proved to have disreputable or criminal parents, or he must be an associate of criminals—that is to say, contaminated—before he is to be given the saving grace of the industrial schools system in Ireland. The principle of prevention has been altogether destroyed by this circular, and we are no longer permitted to assume that a child found in a state of destitution and without sufficient guardianship is likely to fall into crime. That is no longer a sufficient ground to commit according to the circular. Now see the result. When in a previous debate it was asserted that the right hon. Gentleman was dictating to magistrates in Ireland, he said he had no such intention, that the circular was not in the nature of an order, and was only a reminder of the view taken by the authorities as to the true interpretation of the Act. Certain magistrates, having obtained the information from the right hon. Gentleman that the circular was not intended to coerce, very properly, as I think, continued to commit children as they had done for eighteen years; but the Chief Secretary immediately discharged them, and the discretion of the magistrates was defeated. The bishops of Ireland have taken this matter up, and take the view that we have presented to the Committee. We have been bombarded with complaints from the managers of these schools, pointing out the serious loss, and, in some cases, even the utter destruction, which will follow if the system is persisted in, and therefore we are bound to take every possible opportunity of bringing this gigantic evil before Parliament. In preparation for this debate the hon. Member for Waterford, having had the great gravity and importance of this matter brought under his notice, issued a circular to the managers of these schools asking how the system would affect them, and received several replies from very responsible persons. The Rev. James Hamill, P.P., corresponding manager of St. Patrick's Female Industrial School and the Sacred Heart Industrial School, Belfast, writes as follows—

"We have now thirty vacant places in the Sacred Heart School, although Belfast swarms with children who are fit subjects for admission. The practical result of the circular will be, in a short time, the closing of many of the schools, and the rendering of the remainder less able to continue the work they have undertaken."

I need hardly say that before the circular was issued the difficulty was to find places for the applicants. Sister M. de Sales McGeeney, of the Lurgan Industrial School, writes—

"Our school is going down since the issue of the recent circular. In a few years our school, built at great expense, and still in debt, would be empty. Considering how few schools exist in the north, this would be a great misfortune to the poor."

That brings me to another point. These schools have been built by religious communities at great expense, and it is really monstrous, where local charitable resources have been called into play, that this circular should not only ruin the

schools and injure the poor, but render these magnificent buildings useless for the purposes for which they were erected. I do not believe that in the whole world there was such an admirable industrial system as in Ireland. It was a pleasure to go through the schools, the children were so well cared for and so cheerful and happy. The manager of the Sunday's Well School writes—

"It seems quite evident that if children similar to those who have been formerly committed are now deprived of the safeguard of industrial schools, they will of necessity become criminals, for a starving child will steal."

Then the manager of one of the great Dublin schools writes—

"The numbers in the schools are so fast going down that a very few years, perhaps not more than four or five, will put an end to most of them. And the pity of it all! The schools are there—have been an acknowledged success—but they are to be shut up, the children made, perhaps, paupers or criminals of, in preference to changing the words of a legal document. What an enlightened age we live in!"

I really think that language is justified. All these schools have, as I have said, been instrumental in almost abolishing juvenile crime in Ireland. Sister Jones, of the St. Joseph's Industrial School, says—

"Committals have virtually ceased since the issue of this mischievous circular from the Castle authorities to the magistrates in October, 1898, and consequently we have always several vacancies. At present there are twenty-three, and that number is likely to be doubled before the close of the year. Of course this is a serious financial loss, as the general expenses of the establishment must be kept up the same."

From Clifden, Sister Mary Reville writes—

"Should the present restrictions on admission to industrial schools continue to be enforced, the country schools, especially those in our mountainous districts, will very soon be wrecked. If the police are to judge the fitness of the applicant for admission, and not the magistrates, it can easily be seen how this fact must thwart the benevolent intentions of the first framers of the law, which hitherto worked so happily in Ireland."

The manager of Newtonforbes, Longford County, writes—

"We are going down in numbers rapidly. Certified for 145 children, we have twenty-one vacancies, and are likely to have as many more before the year closes. To balance this we have no prospects of fresh committals. We consider the Castle circular has proved most detrimental, so far as the 'committal of children' clause is concerned. Some children have already been discharged by the Chief Secretary, after having been in the institution for short periods, and no reason for such action was made known to us. We have done much to further the interests and welfare of our children, and have spared no expense to fit them for the future in every way. We have spent over £12,000 of our funds (not Government money) to erect buildings for the accommodation of our children, acting under the belief that the institution was never to fail. How is this enormous sum to come back to us, now that there is no better prospect in view than the total destruction of our industrial schools? It is a startling consideration."

I might go on multiplying these cases, but I stop there. I am astonished that the Government should persist in this circular. What is the object? Is it, deliberately against the whole public opinion of Ireland, to wreck a system which any Government ought to be proud of—a system whose object is to take children off the streets of the cities and towns of Ireland and put them into schools where they are trained to earn their bread under the care of self sacrificing women and men who for the most part work for nothing, and devote the whole of their lives to this mission, and afterwards to plant these children out under happy conditions so as to give them a chance in life? If this system were left alone these children would become self-respecting and self-supporting members of society; but if it is wrecked the children will be permitted to run about the town serving an apprenticeship to crime. A more insane policy I never heard of. The Chief Secretary dropped a hint to the deputation which waited upon him, and also in the debate in the House, that he thought under a lax administration of the law an undue burden had been thrown on the Treasury; that is to say that under the strict letter of the law some of these children ought not to have been received into the industrial schools, as they had been a drain on the British Treasury in a total sum of a few thousand pounds. I put the question, what is to become of these children, and where are they to go to? If they are the children of parents whose circumstances are such that they ought to take care of their own children but wickedly do not, the law should

compel them to do so; and if the law is not strong enough for that at present, let the law be strengthened. But if the parents have been reduced to poverty, either through misfortune or sickness, and have no means to support their children, why should not these children be put into industrial schools instead of allowing them to wander about the streets to be placed in the workhouse, where they get the workhouse taint? The result of this circular is that the income of some of the industrial schools has dropped £7,000 or £8,000 a year. The only object of the circular seems to be to save the capitation grant of 5s. for each child. I contend that there was no expenditure in Ireland which was more profitable, and I appeal on that to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, because by striking at the tap-root of crime in the country there was a saving to the Government of the expenditure of imprisoning these children in after life. Therefore, I maintain that the policy of driving these children to the streets for the purpose of saving a few thousand pounds is most narrow and foolish. There is not the least use in concealing the fact that the policy is to drive the children into the workhouse, from which they will be boarded out, and their expense charged on the rates, and thus saved to the Treasury. Now the workhouse child has a horrible mark for life, as any one can see who goes into even the best workhouses in Ireland, and contrasts its condition with that of a child in an industrial school conducted by the unions.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: As the hon. Member himself remarks, this question has already been very fully discussed in the House, and I am rather surprised that he has raised it again this evening. He began by quoting a speech of the O'Conor Don on the occasion when a deputation waited upon me in August last. I rather believe that the O'Conor Don himself then stated that he did not think the magistrates had given that interpretation to the circular which it is now said they put upon it. The circular set forth that many of the places in the industrial schools which ought to be occupied by the poor children for whose benefit the Industrial Schools Act was really intended, children, namely, who, if not taken out of their surroundings, would grow up in vice, were now filled by children who suffered from destitution, and destitution only. The proper objects of the Industrial Schools Acts were therefore kept out of the schools by the latter class. That was the whole case. The system was carried on in a manner that was entirely illegal, and the circular was one of many which was issued with the object of preventing these illegalities. The hon. Gentleman says the system went on for eighteen years; that is absolutely contrary to the fact, and in proof of that I would refer to the Report of the Commission which was appointed in 1882, of which the O'Conor Don was a member. The Report states that it is certain that the Industrial Schools Act is regarded as an institution for poor and destitute children rather than for the children of the criminal classes. A number of children, according to the Report, were sent to these schools who did not come within the purview of the Act, and were sent there mainly on the ground of destitution; and there could be no doubt that there were many children who were sent to industrial schools in Ireland who would not be sent in England, with the result that it was apprehended that many children who were proper subjects for these schools were left in the streets. That is the system which the hon. Gentleman says has given satisfaction in Ireland for eighteen years, and he actually suggests to me that I should have the law changed to correspond with the practice instead of having the practice changed to correspond with the law. It comes to this, that the industrial schools of Ireland should be used for the relief of destitution, and that the general taxpayer should be called upon to pay. That principle is not adopted either in England or in Scotland. Let me say a word with regard to the circular. The hon. Gentleman says that the grant-in-aid of the industrial schools in Ireland has been reduced. That is not the fact, because the grant was £100,000 last year, and it will be the same this year. It is true the attendance has been reduced by the circular, and it would be very strange if it had not, because a great number of the children who ought never to have been admitted have been cut off.

The result will, I hope, be a corresponding increase in the number of committals of children of the class for whom the industrial schools are intended. I will give the Committee the figures. Before the circular was issued the number of children committed for begging attending these schools in 1897 was 924; in 1898 it was reduced to 676, and in 1899 to 232. Of children admitted for causes other than begging, who were properly sent to the industrial schools, the number in 1897 was 486, in 1898 562, and in 1899 723. In the face of these figures I think I am justified in concluding that the object of the circular has been achieved, and that these illegalities will no longer take place, and that there will be a considerable increase in the commitals of the children for whom the Act is intended.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE: The figures quoted by the right hon. Gentleman hardly bear out the statements in the letters which have been received from the managers of industrial schools in Ireland. I do not know how the right hon. Gentleman has arrived at his figures, but those responsible for the administration of the industrial schools system in Ireland declare that the numbers have shown a very considerable falling off. It is perfectly impossible to discuss this question at this hour of the morning, and under such oppressive atmospheric conditions. We have in connection with this matter an instance of the magnificent manner in which Irish affairs are administered. We have only got two days for Irish Supply, and we are supposed to be satisfied, although there are many matters of importance which have not been discussed at all. I wish to ask the Chief Secretary one question. I was a member of a deputation which waited on the right hon. Gentleman on this question, and he informed us that he would make an inquiry as to whether any injury had been inflicted on the industrial schools by the operation of this circular, and that if any injury were inflicted he would see whether it could not be remedied. It would be very interesting if he would inform us what was the result of that inquiry. The Chief Secretary stands on the strict letter of the law, and I assume he has taken legal advice on the matter, but here is the opinion of an eminent legal authority. He says—

"The Lord Lieutenant has no authority to review the decisions of the justices. I attach no weight to the threat that steps will be taken for the discharge of children sent to the schools by order of the justices. In my opinion the 11th Section should be interpreted in a large and liberal spirit, and this becomes little short of legal obligation, having regard to the interpretation put upon the Act and acted on for thirty years. On the faith of this interpretation of the statute, and its judicial exposition by the justices during this long period, schools have been erected at great expense, and mortgage debt incurred, bestowing many blessings on the destitute poor. That all this should be now altered by an executive circular seems to me an injustice and intolerable wrong. The true and large interpretation of the statute is largely supported by the 20th section, which provides for the managers of schools permitting a child to lodge at the dwelling house of his parent. This is certainly not confined to children committed under the 14th section, or to a child whose parent is in prison. It indicates an intention to include a large class who have no visible means of subsistence, *i.e.*, the destitute poor. In my opinion it does include them. The Irish Act purports to extend the English Industrial Schools Act, 1866, to Ireland, from which the 11th section is taken. By the English Act and by another section 'refractory' children are included. I recommend that in every case the absence of visible means should be proved."

The right hon. Gentleman referred to the Report of the Commission which sat in 1882 in justification of his action in issuing the circular, but the circular was not issued until sixteen years afterwards, and it is strange that the right hon. Gentleman should have to go back such a number of years to justify his action. The circular was a most unfortunate one. The Act was doing great good in Ireland, and I am very glad the matter has been raised.

DR. COMMINS (Cork, S.E.): One thing strikes me as very curious in regard to this circular. The interpretation of the law belongs to the Bench, not to the Executive, but this is a matter in which the Executive Government is overriding judgments of the Bench which have been accepted for sixteen years. You would not find a parallel for that in England. Even supposing the magistrates were in error, it was a mistake which hurt nobody. Such action as that taken by the Chief Secretary in Ireland would not be possible

in England. Would it be tolerated for one moment in England? Not at all. Why was not one of these magisterial decisions taken into the Court of Queen's Bench, instead of an interpretation of the Act being given by the issue of an Executive Minute? By the course pursued we have had the judicial and executive functions confounded.

*MR. AUSTIN (Limerick, W.): I wish to make reference to a case that has occurred in my constituency, the circumstances of which must appeal to the sympathy of the Committee. The Chief Secretary had mentioned that the Act was designed for the saving of children, who, if not rescued from their surroundings, would grow up in vice, but I failed to see from the observations he dropped that there was any intention on his part to carry out that object. In the autumn of 1899 a family in Abbeyfeale, in the county of Limerick, were deprived of the breadwinner. That family consisted of six children and the mother, who was delicate, and had no means of supporting them. In the ordinary course of events the mother went to the parish priest, and he took the necessary steps to obtain the admission of the children into the Limerick Industrial Schools. There was no objection at first, but Dublin Castle suddenly sent down an order to have the children removed from the industrial school, and sent back to Abbeyfeale, where all they could do was to wander about the streets. That order roused a great deal of indignation in the public mind, and the magistrates, with the concurrence of the resident magistrate, sent an order for the recommittal of the children to the Limerick Industrial Schools; but another order came down from Dublin Castle ordering their discharge. The parish priest wrote to the right hon. Gentleman, but with no effect. I cannot see for a moment where the operation of this Act as now administered is to be of any benefit. Here was a family with no provision for their support, who were decently brought up, and whose father had been a mechanic. The application for their admission to the industrial school had been fully considered by the magistrates and the resident magistrate, and about which no objection had been taken by the inhabitants of the town, who were fully cognisant of the whole circumstances of the case. But they were sent out into the streets by a telegram from Dublin Castle. I hope that the right hon. Gentleman, after all the remonstrances that have been made by magistrates and others, will take some steps to allow these poor children to be sent back to the Limerick Industrial Schools instead of to the workhouse.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I hope this debate will now be brought to a close and the Vote taken. I was not unwilling that the discussion should be initiated, but it has now proceeded for an hour.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: If it were earlier in the evening, the subject is one of such great interest in Ireland that it ought to be discussed more fully. I recognise, however, that under the circumstances the discussion is now of little or no value, and I do not see any object in prolonging it.

MR. DILLON: In order to obtain a division, I beg formally to move that the Vote be reduced by £10.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £54,757, be granted for the said Service."—(*Mr. Dillon.*)

MR. FLAVIN asked if the Chief Secretary had anything to say in regard to the Abbeyfeale case.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR said he had taken the advice of the Law Officers on the case, and had been told that it would be illegal to send the children to an industrial school.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 50; Noes, 75. (Division List No. 229.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Ambrose, Robert
Austin, M. (Limerick, W.)
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Caldwell, James
Carew, James Laurence
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Clancy, John Joseph
Commins, Andrew
Crean, Eugene
Crilly, Daniel
Curran, Thomas B. (Donegal)
Daly, James
Dillon, John
Doogan, P. C.
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William (Dublin)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Fox, Dr. Joseph Francis
Gibney, James
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Hammond, John (Carlow)
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
Healy, Maurice (Cork)
Healy, Timothy M. (N. Louth
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cumb'land
Macaleese, Daniel
MacDonnell, Dr. M. A. (Q.C.)
M'Dermott, Patrick
M'Ghee, Richard
Mandeville, J. Francis
Molloy, Bernard Charles
Murnaghan, George
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, J. (Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Kelly, James
O'Malley, William
Parnell, John Howard
Pinkerton, John
Power, Patrick Joseph
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shee, James John
Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)
Sullivan, T. D. (Donegal, W.)
Tanner, Charles Kearns

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Sir Thomas Esmonde and
Captain Donelan.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (Leeds)
Banbury, Frederick George
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.)
Chamberlain, J. A. (Worc'r)
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Charrington, Spencer
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Curzon, Viscount
Dalkeith, Earl of
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Faber, George Denison
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.
Finch, George H.
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir R. Penrose-
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Colonel (Lancaster)
Galloway, Wm. Johnson
Gedge, Sydney
Goldsworthy, Major-General
Gordon, Hon. John Edward
Goschen, George J. (Sussex)
Graham, Henry Robert
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Hamilton, Rt. Hn. Lord George
Hanbury, Rt Hon. R. Wm.
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. William
Keswick, William
Lawrence, Sir E Durning- (Corn
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks.)
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Lowles, John
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Macartney, W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
Maclure, Sir John William
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Middlemore, J. Throgmorton
Milward, Colonel Victor
Monckton, Edward Philip
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, Hon. F. (Monm'thsh.)
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Nicholson, William Graham
Phillpotts, Captain Arthur
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plunkett, Rt Hn Horace Curzon
Purvis, Robert
Rentoul, James Alexander
Ritchie, Rt. Hon Chas Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Russell, T. W. (Tyrone)
Saunderson, Rt. Hn Col. Edw. J.
Sidebotham, J. W. (Cheshire)
Stanley, Hon Arthur (Ormskirk
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E. (Kent)
Welby, Lt.-Col. A C E (Taunton
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Sir William Walrond and
Mr. Anstruther.

Original Question put, and agreed to.

Resolutions to be reported upon Monday next; Committee to sit again upon Monday next.

In pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th day of this instant July, Mr. Speaker adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at ten minutes before Two of the clock, till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Monday, 23rd July, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with :—

Post Office Sites.
Edinburgh (Housing of Working Class) Improvement Scheme Provisional Order.

Also the Certificate that no further Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bill :—

Paisley Waterworks Provisional Order.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE.

Report from, That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the following Bills ought to be dispensed with, and the Bills allowed to proceed :—

London, Walthamstow, and Epping Forest Railway (Abandonment).

North Metropolitan Electric Power Supply.

Read, and agreed to.

WEST HAM CORPORATION BILL.

Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

WEST BROMWICH CORPORATION BILL.

Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

CHARING CROSS AND STRAND ELECTRICITY SUPPLY BILL.

Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

CROYDON TRAMWAYS AND IMPROVEMENTS BILL.

Reported, with Amendments.

SCARBOROUGH CORPORATION BILL.

The Queen's consent signified ; and Bill reported, with Amendments.

LANCASTER CORPORATION BILL.

The Queen's consent signified ; and Bill reported, with Amendments.

DURHAM (COUNTY OF) ELECTRIC POWER SUPPLY BILL.

LANCASHIRE ELECTRIC POWER BILL.

Committed. The Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 7) BILL.

The CHAIRMAN of COMMITTEES informed the House that the opposition to the Order was withdrawn. The orders made on Monday and Thursday last discharged, and Bill committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

ALEXANDRA PARK BILL.

The CHAIRMAN of COMMITTEES informed the House that the opposition to the Bill was withdrawn. The orders made on Thursday last discharged, and Bill committed.

TRAMWAYS PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 5) BILL.
(Weston-super-Mare Order).

NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE ELECTRIC SUPPLY BILL.

The Order made on Thursday last appointing certain Lords the Select Committee to consider the Bills, discharged.

SOUTH WALES ELECTRICAL POWER DISTRIBUTION BILL.

Moved, That the Order made on the 12th day of March last, "That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after Tuesday, the 26th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2^a ; agreed to ; and Bill read 2^a accordingly.

SOUTH METROPOLITAN GAS BILL

LONDON AND SOUTH WESTERN RAILWAY BILL.

ABERDEEN CORPORATION TRAMWAYS BILL.

Read 3^a, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

GREAT WESTERN RAILWAY BILL.

Read 3^a, with the Amendments ; further Amendments made ; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

LONDON, WALTHAMSTOW, AND EPPING FOREST RAILWAY (AMENDMENT) BILL.

Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; and referred to the Examiners.

HAMMOND (G. H.) COMPANY BILL [H.L.].

LONDON AND SAN FRANCISCO BANK BILL [H.L.].

Returned from the Commons agreed to.

BELFAST AND COUNTY DOWN RAILWAY BILL.

Returned from the Commons with the Amendment agreed to.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 12) BILL.

JARROW AND HEBBURN ELECTRICITY SUPPLY BILL.

NOTTINGHAM CORPORATION BILL.

Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

EDINBURGH CORPORATION BILL [H.L.].

MERSEY RAILWAY BILL [H.L.].

RAWMARSH URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL (TRAMWAYS) BILL [H.L.].

Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to.

GREAT GRIMSBY STREET TRAMWAYS BILL [H.L.].

MARGATE PIER AND HARBOUR BILL [H.L.].

Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments.

NEWRY, KEADY, AND TYNAN LIGHT RAILWAY BILL.

Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, the opposition thereto having been withdrawn; read, and ordered to lie on the Table: The orders made on the 13th instant and Monday last discharged; and Bill committed.

PLYMOUTH, STONEHOUSE AND DEVONPORT TRAMWAYS BILL.

Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, the opposition thereto having been withdrawn; read, and ordered to lie on the Table: The orders made on the 12th instant and Monday last discharged; and Bill committed for Thursday next.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 9) BILL.
(Dorchester Order.)

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 14) BILL.
(Torquay Order.)

TOTTENHAM URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL BILL.

BRAY AND ENNISKERRY RAILWAY BILL.

Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Earl Waldegrave and the Earl of Carnwath be proposed to the House as members of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Earl Carrington and the Lord Heneage; read, and agreed to.

LONDON (ST. LUKE) PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

LONDON (SOUTHWARK) PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

Read 3ª (according to Order), and passed.

TRAMWAYS PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 5) BILL.
(WESTON-SUPER-MARE ORDER.)

NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE ELECTRIC SUPPLY BILL.

DURHAM (COUNTY OF) ELECTRIC POWER SUPPLY BILL.

LANCASHIRE ELECTRIC POWER BILL.

SHANNON WATER AND ELECTRIC POWER BILL.

Report from the Committee of Selection, That the following Lords be proposed to the House to form the Select Committee for the consideration of the said Bills, viz.—

E. Carnwath,
V. Frankfort de Montmorency,
L. Wolverton,
L. Aberdare,
L. Brassey (chairman).

Agreed to; and the said Lords appointed accordingly. The Committee to meet to-morrow at Eleven o'clock; and all petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Bills to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Bills.

SHANNON WATER AND ELECTRIC POWER BILL.

Moved, That the Order made on the 12th day of March last, "That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after Tuesday, the 26th day of June next," be dispensed with.—(*Lord Lurgan.*)

On Question, motion agreed to.

Moved, That the Bill be now read a second time.—(*Lord Lurgan.*)

THE EARL OF MAYO: My Lords, before the motion that the Bill be read a second time is put, I should like to say a few words with regard to this Bill. When the Bill first came before the House of Commons the scheme was a fairly good one, but now it has been completely altered. Under the Bill the promoters are enabled to take water from the river Shannon by means of a canal to enable them to generate electricity and supply electrical energy within a circuit of thirty miles from the commencement of the works. But before they can abstract any water from the river they have to make a weir, the exact situation of which is not decided upon, and cannot be until fresh plans are deposited. They cannot take property to make a weir until they have been to Parliament again, and they cannot take a drop of water until this weir has been constructed. If the Bill passes the company can, under the provisions of Clause 24, proceed, as soon as they have £10,000 capital subscribed, and £2,000 of that sum paid up, to put in force the compulsory powers of the Bill by taking land. Thus, although they may never receive Parliamentary sanction to their future scheme, and consequently never take water, they can proceed at once to insure land with only £2,000 capital in hand. In the present session there are several Bills promoted with the view of authorising the erection of generating stations and the supply of electricity in bulk, but in these Bills the promoters are coming into extensive districts or areas of supply, where local authorities and companies are already established for supplying electricity, or where there are fields of industry already on foot which would provide customers for taking a supply. In this Bill, however, the area of supply is restricted to a small piece of land in a country parish adjacent to the Shannon, where no industries exist, and the same area of land which is provided as the area for supplying power is provided for their generating stations. It is true that by Clause 10 the promoters take power to supply by agreement electricity in bulk to any local authority, company, or person, whose districts, undertakings, factories, mills, or industries are situate within a circuit of thirty miles from the commencement of Work No. 1, but there are no powers in the Bill for carrying mains through intervening districts to reach such authorities, companies, or persons, and the provision is therefore unworkable. Moreover, no proper provision is made for compensating the riparian owners for loss of water. The fishing industries of the Shannon are one of the great features of Ireland, and produce a rental of some considerable value. If the powers are granted which are asked for by this Bill the loss will be considerable to those employed in these industries, to private owners, and to the community generally. Further, in addition to the interference with existing industries connected with the fisheries there will be a serious interference with the navigation of the river Shannon. I trust your Lordships will not agree to the Second Reading of the Bill.

LORD LURGAN: My Lords, I do not intend to detain your Lordships long on this Bill, and had it not been for the very unusual course of procedure adopted by the noble Earl, that of asking your Lordships to reject the Bill on Second Reading, I should have had very little to say. I shall, however, endeavour to convince your Lordships that the proper course in connection with this Bill is that it shall be referred to a Committee. The object of the Bill is to utilise the redundant waters of the River Shannon for the generation of electric current or energy for the use of undertakings, factories, mills, electric tramways, lighting, and other industries situated within the City of Limerick and the district which surrounds it. The River Shannon, as is well known, is the largest river in the United Kingdom, having a drainage area of some 4,500 square miles, and discharging for the greater portion of the year a great volume of water, which for centuries has been running to waste. The works are extremely simple, and present no engineer-

ing difficulty. The great power station, where some 8,000 horse-power will be developed, will be situated at Clonlara, distant only about four and a half miles from the City of Limerick, which contains a population of some 36,000 people. Limerick is a seaport possessing great natural advantages for trade and commerce, being situate fifty miles inland on the finest navigable river in the United Kingdom, having deep-water docks, extensive quays, and several systems of railway converging upon them from all parts of the country, as well as water carriage by means of the Grand Canal to Dublin. The noble Lord said there were no large industries which would use the electrical power. I differ from him. The largest bacon factories in Ireland are here, as well as the biggest condensed milk factory in the United Kingdom, and the largest flour mills operating in any city in Ireland. There are saw mills, tanneries, and numerous other industries, all of which require the use of steam power. Limerick, however, being on the West Coast of Ireland, suffers greatly from the fact that it has to pay a very high price for imported coal. Thus, the existing industries are greatly handicapped, while the starting of new factories cannot be contemplated in view of the serious difficulties arising from the high cost of producing power. It is to remedy this state of things that the present undertaking has been brought before Parliament. Ireland possesses little or no coal, but has a considerable amount of water power, which, if properly utilised as in other countries, may largely tend to the development of its industries and the employment of its people. Both Italy and Switzerland are countries possessing no coal, but, like Ireland, they have the great advantage of possessing the cheapest form of power — namely, water power. By the fostering care of the Government and the energy of the people, these two countries have overcome the difficulties arising from the want of coal, and are now rapidly becoming large manufacturing centres. It is needless to refer to the vast developments which have taken place in America and Canada, where water power is used so fully for electrical development applicable to all manufacturing uses. The idea of utilising the waste water power of the Shannon dates back to the time when Sir Robert Kane pointed out the great advantage that would occur to the whole country, from an industrial point of view, if the water power of this great river was properly employed. The case before Parliament is very different from that where water is abstracted from the river and carried away never to be returned again to its original source. Here a portion only—after the fullest allowance has been made for maintaining a great river twice the size of the Thames at Teddington, always flowing down the natural course before any water is abstracted—is utilised for driving the turbines, a supplemental steam plant being provided to meet the possible emergency of a dry summer. The Bill provides that under no circumstances shall any water be abstracted from the river unless and until 90,000 cubic feet a minute, equal to 800,000,000 gallons a day, is passing down the river between the inlet and outlet of the proposed works leading to and from the turbines. At the outlet the whole water is again returned, so that from this point to the sea the river remains absolutely as it was before; and here it is that the valuable fisheries of the Shannon exist. The whole value of the Shannon Fisheries is given as £40,000 a year, but the value of the portion of the river between the inlet and the outlet for which the 90,000 cubic feet a minute is provided is only given by the opponents of the Bill as £2,500 a year. The strongest evidence has been given that with the large flow provided under the clauses of the Board of Works and the Fishery Board no injury will be sustained, but the Bill provides the usual clauses for safeguarding the interests of any persons proved to be injuriously affected; and if the Bill is sent to the Committee in the usual way every opportunity will be afforded to those represented in the solitary petition that remains against the preamble to prove their case. When the Bill was first introduced some six petitions were lodged against it. The most important of these was the petition of the Public Board of Works in Ireland, who, under Act of Parliament, are the custodians of the River Shannon throughout its entire course from Lough Allen to the sea, a distance of some 150 miles, their especial duty being the maintenance of the navigation and the regulations of the floods for drainage purposes. Allied with them

to a large extent were the inspectors of Irish fisheries, also constituted by Act of Parliament and now incorporated into the Irish Agricultural Board, presided over by the Chief Secretary and the Right Hon. Horace Plunkett. These two Government bodies having the charge of the navigation and the fisheries considered with the greatest care the project now before Parliament as affecting the questions of navigation and fisheries, and, after several months of negotiation, clauses of a very stringent character were put forward in the joint interests of the two bodies, accepted by the promoters, and embodied in the Bill. By these clauses it is provided that no water shall be taken from the river until the 90,000 cubic feet, before referred to, passes over the weir situated below the proposed intake of the canal, and, further, that the Board of Works shall have the right to shut down the sluices on the promoter's canal the moment a less quantity than 90,000 cubic feet a minute is passing down the river. Numerous other clauses have been embodied giving power to the Board of Works and the Fishery Board to control the regulating weir and sluices, to provide such openings for salmon, eels, and other fish as they may deem requisite, and to oblige the promoters to put up such screens at the inlet and outlet as may be thought desirable. Thus in every manner the fullest precautions have been taken by the two public Departments to safeguard the public interests. Of the other petitions, that of next importance was the petition of the Corporation of Limerick for the protection of their waterworks, but here, again, after the most careful investigation and a report made to the corporation by a very experienced waterworks engineer, that body came to the conclusion that it was in the best interests of the city that the project should be carried out. They have, in fact, settled clauses and sealed a petition in favour of the Bill, and will appear before the Committee of your Lordships' House to support it in every way in their power. In like manner the Harbour Board of Limerick have sealed a petition in favour, and by glancing at the statement made by the promoters it will be observed that twenty-three bodies, including the county councils of Limerick, Clare, and Tipperary, all the district councils in the proposed area of supply, the boards of guardians and numerous other bodies have sealed petitions or passed resolutions, in almost every case unanimously urging upon Parliament the desirability of passing the Bill. It is significant that the Commissioners of Public Works have absolutely petitioned your Lordships' House against alterations, and paragraph 3 of that petition recites that—

> "During the passage of the Bill through the House of Commons, clauses were introduced for the protection of the petitioners, and your petitioners are content with the Bill as the same is now settled."

They beg that no alteration should be made, and that the Bill should pass into law as it now stands, showing that they, as representing not only themselves, but as acting in concert with the Fishery Board, are fully satisfied that the promoters have agreed to every reasonable condition. It would, therefore, seem in the public interest that the unusual course adopted by the opponents to destroy the Bill on the Second Reading, after it has passed every stage in the House of Commons, should be resisted by your Lordships' House, and that no narrow view or petty interest should be allowed to stand in the way of a project which must confer lasting benefits on the whole community.

*LORD MASSY: My Lords, as one of the riparian owners and an owner of Shannon fisheries I have great pleasure in supporting my noble friend's motion to reject the Bill. If this Bill becomes law a large portion of a very important spawning bed between Limerick and Castle Connell will be left high and dry at the most critical time of the year—namely, from 1st November to 1st February, when the fish are spawning. The other portion of the spawning bed will have so little water flowing over it that it will be perfectly impossible for heavy salmon to spawn. Not only rod fishing, but the fisheries in general all along the Shannon, will be interfered with by this Bill. The noble Lord said the water will be all returned. True, but between the inlet and the outlet there are several miles of river that will be left practically dry. The noble Lord said the promoters proposed to place their generating station at Clonlara, and to transmit electricity from there to the principal works in Limerick; but, as a matter of fact, not a single one

of those mercantile works has applied for electrical energy, knowing perfectly well that they can work their machinery, as they do now, by steam at a much less cost for power than would be the case if they used electricity. The noble Lord said the Fishery Board has supported this Bill. They may have done so, but they have withheld their Report, which looks very much as if the Reports of the Fishery Inspectors were dead against it.

THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (The Earl of MORLEY): My Lords, I think the House, after having heard the speeches that have been delivered, will have come to the conclusion, without a shadow of a doubt, that this Bill ought not to be stopped at the Second Reading. The Bill is one for a very large commercial enterprise. It has passed through the House of Commons, it was fought in Committee there, and it is extremely unusual, I may say quite unparalleled, that it should be thrown out on Second Reading. I am surprised that the noble Earl should have adopted the unusual course of asking the House to reject it at this stage. I do not think it is necessary for me to say anything more, but I hope your Lordships will give the Bill a Second Reading and allow it to go to Committee.

On Question, agreed to. Bill read 2ª accordingly, and committed; the Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

UNIVERSITIES (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1889.

General Report of the Commissioners under the Universities (Scotland) Act, 1889; with an appendix containing ordinances, minutes, correspondence, evidence, and other documents.

INDIA FAMINE.

Advances and gifts to agriculturists for seed, cattle, and subsistence at the end of the famine.

RAILWAYS (CONTINUOUS BRAKES).

Return by the railway companies of the United Kingdom for the six months ending the 31st December, 1899.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

Lord Massy.

CHINA—ANTI-FOREIGN OUTBREAK—PRESENTATION OF PAPERS.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: My Lords, I desire to ask the noble Marquess the Prime Minister a question of which I have given him private notice—namely, whether it is his intention to lay upon the Table of the House any Papers relating to Chinese affairs, and, if so, whether they are likely to be presented soon.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (The Marquess of SALISBURY): In reply to the noble Earl, I have to say that the Papers in regard to Chinese affairs are in an advanced state of preparation, but that, as they involve communications with other European Powers, a certain amount of reference is necessary before they can be laid upon the Table of the House. I hope, however, the delay will not be very long, and that they will be laid on the Table in a few days.

EDUCATION BILL [H.L.].

[SECOND READING.]

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*The Duke of Devonshire.*)

*LORD NORTON: My Lords, I should like to call your Lordships' attention to a feature in this Bill, and one that has appeared in every proposition which has lately been made for the purpose of secondary education, which seems to me of the gravest importance and fraught with mischief to this country. I hope we are not entering now upon a course of free secondary education for all classes in the country. The Bill, if extended and developed, as I have no doubt it will be next session, seems to me to be a most satisfactory mode of dealing with this important subject, but it must be borne in mind that the Bill cannot be all one would wish, because it has to deal with a subject which is already very much complicated. It has not a free field. The field is already largely occupied and is being more occupied every year, so that the Bill cannot propose the best scheme in the abstract, but the scheme which will least conflict with what is going on already. It cannot organise, as it pretends to do, a system of local authorities for secondary education throughout the country, but has to co-organise with what is largely existing at

present with as little conflict as possible. It will be observed that there is no attempt in this Bill to draw any line of demarcation between secondary and elementary education. The whole is handed over to the central authority, which we constituted last year, with a principal secretary at the head and two principal assistant secretaries under him, who are stated to be for two branches—one for elementary education and the other for secondary education. But there is no attempt whatever made in the Bill to draw the distinction between the one and the other. The nearest thing to a definition is in the title of the Bill which calls everything secondary that is not elementary, but that does not give a very distinct idea of what the intention of the Bill is. The Bill proposes to hand over all public money hitherto devoted to secondary education to county councils and other local authorities. What is known as the "beer-money," amounting to nearly a million a year, and the local rate for technical instruction are handed over, and a public seizure of private endowments. But it is not proposed to ask the rich manufacturers and the tradesmen, who will make use of this Bill for the education of their sons for lucrative employments, for one penny by way of fees. I do not think it is right or safe that we should undertake in this country to give rich manufacturers and well-to-do tradesmen the apprenticeship of their sons to remunerative employments at the public expense, for that is what the Bill amounts to. The pros and cons of free secondary education were amply discussed in the Report of the Royal Commission, who rightly came to a conclusion against it. Though there is no line drawn between elementary and secondary education, yet we must all understand what elementary and secondary education broadly mean as distinguished one from the other. Secondary education is in the nature of higher scientific instruction, and, in fact, when you consider the class to whom it applies, it is practically an apprenticeship to industrial and skilled employments. Technical instruction is included in secondary education generally, and I observed that, when the noble Duke said that, there was a murmur of approval, showing that the House approved of the merging of technical instruction into secondary education generally. But if secondary education is a higher class of instruction for a higher class of society, who are perfectly capable of paying for their own sons' education, I maintain that it is a matter for serious consideration whether the State should undertake it for them, and relieve them of their primary and most important natural responsibility. I think that we have gone too far already in the way of gratuitous education, in the elementary schools of this country. I attribute the lax attendance in elementary schools, complained of in all the recent reports of inspectors, to the depreciation in the estimate of parents of that education of their children which is forced upon them as a public gift. A thing that is offered for nothing is supposed to be worth nothing. If we extend gratuitous education where there is no excuse of poverty at all we shall strike a blow at the spirit of independence and self administration in the people. It is a minor consideration that taxpayers who have no use of the schools will resent having to pay for those who have. For secondary education which is of a higher kind, the whole expense in the schools so provided should be covered by the fees of the well-to-do parents who take advantage of them. I am for an unlimited number of free scholarships for the poorer classes where there is any case of exceptional aptitude shown for higher scientific education; but I would make wealthy parents defray the cost of the education of their children. The idea of the *doctrinaires* who are pushing us on in this ideal scheme is, a free State education which should include Eton and Harrow up to the Universities—they are really trying to force upon this country a Prussian State system of education for all classes. They are always quoting foreign schools as inferior to ours, and advising us to imitate them, but I am quite certain England has not the slightest wish to do so. The feeling in this country I am sure is very much more in favour of the independent education of their children by capable parents. They have no wish to introduce the Prussian system here. I do not believe there is an Englishman who does not think an English youth is preferable to a German student. I fear that the present private enterprise and municipal ambition in promoting secondary education will be stopped if such education is to be paid for by public money

for all classes; and when the Bill is brought up next year I will move that the cost shall be generally met by fees, and public money which is devoted to secondary education shall be spent in providing free scholarships for the poorer classes. To define poorer classes may be somewhat difficult, but it is done by their limit of income, or by their belonging to the wage-earning classes.

*Earl SPENCER: My Lords, I was very glad to give way to my noble friend Lord Norton when he rose to speak on this subject, for he has a much longer experience than I have of these matters, and his opinion ought to be heard with attention by your Lordships. I shall not follow my noble friend through the arguments he has used. I, for one, am not likely to approve of any system which is to introduce what he calls the Prussian system into this country. I value extremely the peculiar, perhaps, but independent education given in this country, and I should be the last to approve of trying to found a new system on the lines of those we see abroad. I shall not follow the noble Lord even on the subject of free education. I shall leave that to the noble Duke who will reply, but I am at a loss to see the danger there is in this Bill on that subject. Certainly, if the noble Lord urges his view against free primary education as well as this I should not agree with him. The discussion to-night must be somewhat academic, as the noble Duke has announced that he does not intend to carry the Bill beyond the Second Reading this year, but he challenges those of us in this House who are interested in the subject to discuss the measure. I confess that I was somewhat surprised when my noble friend the noble Duke made his speech in introducing the Bill to find that three parts of that speech was confined to a description of the reorganisation of the Education Department, and only a small portion of it, in comparison, to a description of the Bill itself. When I had the Bill in my hands, however, I was not surprised at the importance which the noble Duke attached to the reorganisation of the Education Department, for I will venture to say that very large, I think too large, powers have been given to the Education Board without Parliamentary restrictions, and therefore it is of more consequence than even that the Board shall be placed on such a footing that the country will repose confidence in it. I do not, myself, object to the proposals which the noble Duke has made for rearranging the system of dividing the work of the Education Department. I do not materially differ from that course, for I have always held that all parts of education should be bound together. They are co-ordinate one with the other—primary, secondary, and technical. Each must depend and have a direct influence on the other, and I therefore do not seriously object to the noble Duke's change of attitude in having only two principal assistant secretaries, one for primary education and the other for both secondary and technical education. But I am bound to say that, very properly, a good deal of notice outside Parliament has been taken of the manner in which the noble Duke has made these appointments. At the head of secondary and technical education the noble Duke has placed a very able man—Sir William Abney. I for one shall not say a word against Sir William Abney. I know him to be a man of first class ability, and I should say of liberal and broad views; but he has been entirely, so far as education is concerned, connected with science and art, and there is a fear outside that if he is placed at the head of the proposed double Department he may lay too much stress on science and art, and not deal as broadly and as liberally as he ought with secondary education. That view is somewhat strengthened when it is seen what has been done as regards the assistant secretaries There are two assistant secretaries already, and two more have been added. The two present assistant secretaries are old South Kensington men, entirely devoted to the Science and Art Department, and one of the new assistant secretaries, whom the noble Duke did not name the other day, is to be connected with the technological system. Therefore, three out of the four assistant secretaries are directly connected with technical education. The fourth assistant secretary, Mr. Bruce, a man of whom I speak with the highest possible admiration, is to deal with the secondary part of education. He possesses all the qualifications for dealing with the subject, and was Secretary to the Secondary Education Commission, which brought so many important facts to bear on this subject, and whose Report is of

such great value. There are many persons of influence interested in education who feel that Mr. Bruce ought to have been a joint principal secretary with Sir William Abney, instead of being placed under him. I wish for a moment to refer to what the noble Duke said in moving the First Reading of this Bill,* and which, I think, may have been misunderstood in the country. The noble Duke—I am quoting from *The Parliamentary Debates*—said—

"We hope and intend that the idea of the future education branch of the office will be to make science and art instruction a part of general education in addition to those clerical and literary studies which have hitherto formed its main portion."

With that I entirely agree; but the Lord President went on to say—

"In the schools and institutions directly assisted by the Board of Education the teaching of science and of art, with the addition, perhaps, of some commercial subjects, will probably remain the principal object."

The noble Duke went on to refer to the older secondary schools, and said—

"We hope that the scientific resources of the Board will be placed at their disposal if they desire, as many of them do desire, to develop the more modern sides of instruction and education. . . . As I have said, it probably will be the case that any interposition of the Board in regard to secondary education will be in the direction of endeavouring to substitute more modern for the older studies; but it ought not to be difficult to find administrators of sufficiently wide knowledge and experience to make the latter result impossible."

Those sentences of the noble Duke seem to imply that the new development is almost entirely to be in science and art, and he ends in this remarkable way, referring to Mr. Bruce—

"Under him (Sir William Abney) the assistant secretary, who will be chiefly concerned with the literary side of instruction, will be Mr. Bruce."

With regard to that, I think the noble Duke has suffered some injustice, because in the report of his speech in the public press, which has been circulated throughout the country, a very important word is left out. In *The Times* the noble Duke is reported to have said—

"Under him the assistant secretary, who will be concerned with the literary side of instruction, will be Mr. Bruce."

The important word "chiefly" is omitted, and I think it is only fair to the noble Duke that I should mention this, as the insertion of the word makes all the difference. I am afraid that the speech of the noble Duke in introducing the Bill will create the impression in the country that the new Education Board will lean a great deal more to the old Science and Art modes of action than to a genuine and sound system of secondary education, which is so much wanted. I hope the noble Duke will be able to be more explicit than he was on that occasion as to his views when he replies to the debate to-night. If he leaves the case as it now stands I am afraid there will be a considerable chance of the Department losing the confidence of those interested in education. I now come to the Bill itself. I am afraid there will be some disappointment in regard to it. The Bill is not as far-reaching as it might be, and I am afraid it will not establish in the country the means of secondary education which are so much wanted. When I say that I am not for a moment wishing that in every locality, quite irrespective of its requirements, a new secondary school should be erected; but I think secondary education should be within the reach of every clever boy or girl in the country by means of scholarships or otherwise. What do we find elsewhere? In other countries and in the colonies we find such a system in existence. You will find in almost every district in the colonies an admirable secondary school, established sometimes with free education, which my noble friend Lord Norton dislikes so very much, and sometimes with low fees. Not many years ago I had the pleasure of visiting a fine set of schools at Winnipeg, in Manitoba. I found there an admirable primary school, and there was in the same building a secondary school, admirably furnished and admirably equipped for giving secondary education to all within reach of that school. I think the people of this country may really have a serious complaint to make of Parliaments and Governments if they put the young men and women of this country at a serious disadvantage as compared with those in the colonies. I at once admit that there are certain parts of the Bill to which I can give my hearty approval, such as the provision which makes it compulsory on local authorities to use the whole of the "whisky money," or, as the noble Lord opposite called it, the "beer money," for education. I do not

* See *The Parliamentary Debates* [Fourth Series], Vol. lxxxiv., page 1031.

know that that will reach very far, for I am happy to think there are very few districts in which the money is devoted to the relief of rates or for any other purpose than education. I welcome also the alteration in the rate. It is not altogether an increase of a penny in the £, as I think the noble Duke explained, for in some places urban authorities can raise a penny in the £, and in the same county the county authority may do the same; but in the arrangement proposed in this Bill the county authorities will have the whole distribution and control of this twopence in the £. I think there will be considerable gain by doing away with the fiction which now exists in the definition of technical and secondary education in many places. The county authorities, believing that it is absolutely necessary that there should be a system of sound secondary education before trying to engraft into it technical education, have strained that principle and there has been considerable fiction in what has been done with regard to this point. In my opinion the method by which the Bill proposes to raise the new authorities for secondary education is much too vague. A great deal too much is left to the Department without any control, or very little control, by Parliament. In a matter of such great national importance, Parliament ought to lay down very precisely certain conditions on which these bodies are to be formed. The noble Duke has probably taken the machinery for this to some extent from the Welsh Intermediate Education Act, but he has not followed the precedent of that Act very closely. In that Act there was a special joint Committee for proposing schemes created before the final authority was made. I do not know that the difference is very great, but the present Bill leaves it to the county council to form the scheme and submit it to the Education Board. I think the other plan would be more preferable, and would bring more local interest to bear. I recognise that a certain amount of elasticity must be introduced for the formation of these schemes. Speaking roughly, there are two bodies, or two kinds of bodies that have to be considered. There are urban bodies and rural bodies. The urban bodies are in a very different position from the rural bodies, for they cover what are called the non-county towns. I know that raises a very difficult question, but at some time or other it will have to be faced. Possibly the noble Duke will say it will be faced by the schemes which will be submitted to the Department by the county councils. I for one should like very much to see certain elected bodies represented on these Committees for managing secondary education. There are a great many references in the Bill, and it is not quite clear whether certain matters are included in it or not. I do not know whether when a council aids a school they are entitled to place on the management of that school representatives in proportion to the grant made. This is to my mind most essential. I think county councils ought in every case to have a majority on the Committees, and in the towns I should like to see the school boards represent the minority. It is essential, particularly in towns, that near connection should be maintained between primary and secondary education. There are difficulties, such as those to which the noble Duke alluded, as to higher grade schools which will be removed to a large extent by having representatives of the school boards who have to deal with these higher grade schools on the committees for managing secondary education. In rural districts, I know, this will be impossible, for there are not school boards all over the country. I deeply regret this. I am not against Voluntary schools, and I do not wish to see them all turned into Board schools, but I do wish to see throughout the country school boards established through which the sums voted by Parliament or the rates should pass. At present no such bodies exist in many rural districts; and, therefore, it is impossible to lay down that the rural county councils should have representatives of school boards on their committees. It seems, therefore, probable that with regard to these rural county councils some system of co-optation will have to be agreed to, but I should be opposed to Government nomination. Universities and colleges are named. That may be all very well in certain places where colleges or universities are placed in the midst of counties, but there are many counties where this could not take place. I now come to certain other difficulties which I see in the Bill. To those who have followed the education debates and discussions throughout the country it must be a matter of deep sorrow that such bitter

feuds should exist with regard to matters connected with the religious question in primary schools. I believe that the very fact of the existence of these feuds prevents the spread and the management in the best way of education throughout the country. Happily, up to this moment technical education has not had any difficulty of this sort. I wish I could think that this Bill would not introduce any difficulty in the future, but I confess that I fear that some clauses of the Bill may bring the religious feud into questions connected with secondary education. The noble Duke may be able to explain the clauses better than they are understood elsewhere, but there are many people who believe—and there is reason for thinking they are right in their belief—that you will be able under this Bill, with hardly any restriction on the management, to what is called bolster up purely denominational schools by the large grants made to them for apparatus and various other matters. I must say I should deeply regret that, and I am quite certain there will be throughout the country very strong opposition to anything which might be regarded as indirect endowments to denominational secondary schools without any representative control. I should be content, and I know a great many of those with whom I have been spoken would be content, if the noble Duke introduced into the Bill some such restrictions or conditions with regard to religious instruction, as are to be found in the Welsh Intermediate Education Act, and I hope that if the Bill comes before Parliament again it will be modified in this respect. I come now to the question of private schools. No doubt there are a great many private schools in the country which give very good secondary education. I should be very sorry to see those schools deprived, under certain conditions, of the benefits which would arise under inspection, or to prevent clever boys from them winning scholarships under these schemes; but I confess I have a strong opinion that private schools for secondary education should not directly receive aid under this Bill. I have admitted that there are very excellent private schools, but private schools depend on the skill of the man who is at the head of them. He is often a very clever man, and makes the school succeed and become a great financial success; but, should death unfortunately remove him, would it be right to go on with his successor, who might be a perfectly incompetent person? If you once get committed to aids to a particular school it is very difficult, on the first change of the headmaster, to give up making your grant. It is quite different in the case of public companies, who manage their schools on a broad and liberal basis. I should be quite ready to agree to exceptional treatment being allowed to some of these private schools which are under public companies not making a large profit. Unless something of this kind is done, I am afraid that there will be a race on the part of private schools to obtain grants under the Bill, and there will be a chance, in certain districts, at all events, of a great many incompetent schools, giving secondary education, receiving these grants. I therefore do not like the third section of Clause 3. There are certain omissions from the Bill, some of which are of considerable importance. I do not find a clause throwing upon the local authority the duty of satisfying public demands for secondary education in their district. I have in vain searched for it. I have looked back at some of the other Acts which are to be read with this Bill; and I am afraid I do not see anything which will meet the difficulty. It seems to me absolutely necessary, if you are to provide sufficient secondary education for every child all over the country, that the duty should be thrown on the authority managing secondary education to provide such education as the demands of the district require. There is another omission. There is no clause in this Bill like the seventeenth clause of the Bill of 1896.

THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (The Duke of DEVONSHIRE): The Bill of 1896?

EARL SPENCER: I mean the Bill that did not pass. That clause is of great importance for this reason. Ever since this subject has been dealt with it has always been urged that the endowments which exist in different parts of the country should be used for the purpose for which they were originally intended—namely, secondary education. We all know that in many districts numbers of these grammar schools have fallen into a hopeless state of decrepitude. Their

funds are absolutely useless for the purpose of education, and the money is being wasted. I know, from my own experience, that in some parts of the country old grammar schools have been revived and put under new schemes, with the result that they are doing exceedingly well. In Wales the power of approaching the body who have the granting of new schemes—the Charity Commission—was placed in the hands of the secondary education bodies, and I am told that in Wales, owing to their influence in the localities, those bodies have been in many instances successful in getting old grammar schools put on a better footing and in utilising their endowments for the public good. If that is so I consider this is a matter of very great importance, and I regret that the noble Duke has not included some such provision in this Bill. On two points explanation is necessary to satisfy the fears of some highly intelligent persons outside Parliament, who are not, perhaps, so versed in dealing with Bills as members of your Lordships' House, and who have read the clauses of the Bill as enabling the authorities under it to make grants to any other form of education. That expression appears at the end of the first section of Clause 1, and it appears again at the end of the first section of Clause 2. An idea has been created that this might place primary education under the control of local councils. I confess myself that I do not share that idea, because the clauses are governed by the title of the Bill, which declares the Act to be—

"An Act to make better provision for enabling county councils and other local authorities to aid forms of education not being elementary."

If it were intended that the Bill should go to Committee, I should move that these words be added to the first sub-section of Clauses 1 and 2 in order to make this point clear. The noble Duke will no doubt be able to say something which will explain how this matter stands, for the benefit of those who are exceedingly anxious about it outside Parliament. Another matter I press upon the noble Duke is that he should not hastily draw a line of demarcation between secondary and primary schools. I quite agree with the noble Duke that there is very considerable difficulty in so doing, and I rejoice to see that he is not, at all events, in a hurry to draw that line. I think it would be a very great loss to education if the line were so drawn as to take the higher grade schools away from the management of the school boards. I am aware that the noble Duke has issued an Order regulating what are to be the higher grade schools still remaining under the Board of Education, but I am afraid, from what I hear, that the Order will throw a good many schools into very great difficulty, cause great dissatisfaction, and stop their admirable educational work in many parts of the country. I believe that these higher grade schools have become almost a necessity in many places. I will quote the opinion of a gentleman who was very well known to the noble Duke and myself when we were both at Cambridge—the late Chief Inspector of the Education Board, Mr. Sharpe. In his general Report for 1897 Mr. Sharpe said—

"But if a good system of secondary schools should in the distant future be established, I do not think that even then a hard-and-fast line can be drawn between primary and secondary schools, and there must be of necessity some overlapping of subjects; it would be unjust to deprive the higher primary schools of the liberty of taking some part of the subjects which might be held to belong to secondary schools. Unless a system of County Council or other scholarships can be devised, which would remove all the more clever boys to a secondary school at an age that would leave three or four years of subsequent study, boys who have only two years longer of school life would be better left in the higher primary school, with whose methods and teachers they are familiar."

I think these are very wise words, and I venture again to press on the noble Duke that he should not be in too great a hurry to draw this line of demarcation, though at some future day it will have to be drawn. I am afraid I have detained your Lordships at considerable length, but my excuse must be the great importance of the subject. It is one in which the country takes the deepest possible interest. In my opinion this Bill is hardly adequate, and in some respects I am afraid it opens dangerous topics. If I am mistaken in this I shall be glad, for I am certain that the sooner a sound, good system of secondary education in the country is established, the better. We talk a great deal of the absolute necessity, in these days of keen competition in commerce with other nations, of giving a wide and good technical education, but I venture to say that we must include secondary with technical educa-

Earl Spencer.

tion, for without a good grounding in secondary education it is vain and futile to impart technical instruction to pupils.

*THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: My Lords, I think it is quite true that the proposals in the first clause of the Bill are too vague, and that we ought to have a more distinct statement of the principle on which these educational committees are to be formed. It is a very marked thing, and I do not think it is a right thing, that for the first time in legislation of this sort, so far as I can remember, these schemes are not to be submitted to Parliament. Parliamentary control over them is altogether gone. Hitherto it has been the practice, when schemes are made for endowed schools, for instance, that every such scheme should be submitted to Parliament and discussed either in this House or in the other House. I think it is rather a misfortune that Parliament is not called upon in the same way to deal with such schemes as are proposed under Clause 1 of this Bill, because there can be no question at all that the discussions in Parliament have a great effect not only upon the scheme under discussion, but upon the general course of public opinion on these matters. As to the proposals with regard to religious education, the noble Earl seems to think that denominational religious education is something bad in itself.

EARL SPENCER: I do not think it is bad in its proper place.

*THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: I think it is a mistake to say it should not come within secondary education. That is the place where, indeed, it is most wanted. The experience of the working of schools since 1870 has very distinctly brought before us this fact, that the undenominational education given does not reach the religious instruction desired by religious people to be given. Those who are anxious that religious education should be given mean not only that the learners should be taught particular doctrines but that they should be trained to apply all religious doctrines to their ordinary life, and you do not get that training from any teacher who is not very much in earnest about the religious instruction which he gives. There are teachers, I have no doubt, who are very much in earnest and who would do good work of that kind, although restricted from handling the religious instruction which they give quite freely. I have no doubt there are such teachers, but they do not abound. As a rule, if you leave a man free he will teach such religious education as he himself believes in, and he will teach it tolerably well in proportion to that belief; but you will not get a man who is very much in earnest in these matters to give a thorough-going religious education if you say to him he must leave out a large part of that which, in his own eyes, is of very great importance as an ingredient in all such education. Denominational education has this merit about it, that it always tends to carry with it, not merely religious knowledge, but religious training in a sense in which I do not believe that you would get it from teachers who are hampered by the undenominational system. I do not mean to say that I have any fault to find with the undenominational system if you can get teachers who are really able to give true religious instruction under that form, but I do say that the number of teachers who can do it is extremely limited, and that whilst you can get a few to do it, and to do it well, you do not get a very great number. Therefore, I think that anything which damages denominational education in this part of the educational system would be a very serious mischief. I do not wish to find fault with the proposals that are in the Bill, but I should like, if possible, to secure for denominational teaching what was allowed by the Department a little while ago in a training college that was established for mistresses. In that case it was provided that the residential part of the training college should be denominational, but that it should have also a non-residential part, and there the conscience clause came in. There was a fair compromise between the two systems, and I think the application of that principle in the provision of schools for secondary education might very well be allowed, and would get rid of all the difficulty on this subject with greater ease than any other proposal that I have yet heard of. That in day schools there should be a conscience clause is fair enough. The teaching in day schools can be managed in such a way that the with-

drawal of certain children is not a very serious difficulty; but when you come from day schools to boarding schools the thing is different, and I hold that, where these boarding-houses are in the hands of denominational managers, religious instruction should be given to all who are living within those houses. It would be a difficult thing to provide anything of this sort in elementary schools, because there, from the nature of the case, you have not got boarding-houses at all. But in secondary education it is certain that a very large proportion of the pupils will be living in boarding-houses, and to impose a conscience clause in such cases would be doing nobody any good whatever, but would impose on a good many a great burden, because it is so very difficult to manage a home in which you have different religious persuasions present. The students ought to be treated as if they were in their own homes. I venture to put this before the House and before the noble Duke, the Lord President, because it is consistent with the principle that has been already adopted, and will, I think, make a very great difference in the working of a Bill such as this. I should be very sorry if the result should be to bring denominational religious instruction into any place where it ought not to come, but I venture to think you ought to be very careful indeed before you decide that secondary education is such a thing that into the homes which I have described denominational religious education ought never to enter. Those are the only remarks I wish to make at this point on Clause 3; but I desire also to say a word with regard to Clause 4. In that clause it is stated that—

> "Every council shall, in the exercise of their powers of establishing and aiding schools under the said Acts," etc.

I think it would be a help to us all when this Bill reaches Committee if in the margin a reference was made to the places in those Acts where this power of establishing schools is given. The power of aiding schools is given plainly enough, but I have not been able to find where there is power given in the Technical Instruction Acts to establish schools. I think it would be as well that that matter should be cleared up. In conclusion, I wish to add that while I have not the slightest desire to prevent the Bill from becoming law, I think it comes twenty years too late.

The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.

LORD REAY: My Lords, after the careful analysis of the Bill which has been made by my noble friend behind me, I do not intend to go into the details of the measure, but I wish to call the attention of the House to the general aspect of the question of secondary education. What is the great need of the country with regard to secondary education at the present time? The answer is, a proper distribution of the time which is available for education. The great danger at the present moment is the overloaded curriculum, because insufficient allowance is made for the great variety of existing demands. Where a boy's education ends at fifteen, it is quite clear that he will have to distribute his time differently than if he ends his education at eighteen; and the next question which arises is, what kind of education will be required in view of the profession or career on which the boy will enter? A sailor must have a different education from that of a soldier, and a doctor must have a different education from that of an engineer. We must therefore provide for two things, and keep them very distinct—general secondary education, and special secondary education, taking into account the leaving age and the profession on which the scholars intend to enter. I am very thankful that no attempt has been made in this Bill to draw the line of demarcation between primary, secondary, and higher education. It is a very remarkable fact that quite lately two very eminent statesmen in France—MM. Poincaré and Bourgeois—in giving evidence before a Secondary Education Commission, both agreed that it was quite impossible to draw the line between primary, secondary, and higher education. That is all the more remarkable, because in the organisation of the French Ministry of Public Education there is a director for primary education, a director for secondary education, and a director for higher education. If, therefore, the demarcation has failed in France, we may conclude that we should not be more successful in a similar attempt. There are so many openings for English boys that we must necessarily have a great variety of curricula. However limited the time may be at the disposal of those who have to teach the boy, a sound general education must be given as a solid foundation. It is on that point that I wish to enter into some detail, because my impression is that the

ideas of the Board of Education of what constitutes a general education are not very clear. The longer you can defer the period of specialisation the better. When I received the Minute on Higher Elementary Schools, I thought that these principles were recognised, and that it was intended to give a general education up to the age of fifteen—the limit of the Free Education Act—to all those who would be qualified and prepared to make good use of it. The Minute contemplated "suitability of instruction to the circumstances of the scholars and the neighbourhood." That was exactly what was wanted, and it could not mean anything but a differentiation of the curricula of higher elementary schools. Under these circumstances the School Board for London asked for the recognition of forty-three separate schools for boys and girls in seventy-nine departments. That sounds a very large figure, but when I tell your Lordships that it only means one higher elementary school per 100,000 inhabitants, and that in the small kingdom of Saxony there are forty-four commercial schools, you will at once see that it was by no means an exaggerated demand. What was the answer of the Department? It was that—

> "The Board of Education will be ready to entertain a proposal for the conversion of the schools of science provided by the school board, into higher elementary schools, and in localities where additional schools of science might, so far as educational reasons are concerned, be recognised, the Board of Education will consider an application for the recognition of a higher elementary school."

The decision of the Board of Education is in direct contradiction with the words I have quoted from the Minute, for the simple reason that in London the education wanted by far the greater number of boys is not that of a school of science, and that as regards girls it is absolutely unsuitable. We have seventy-nine higher grade departments in connection with the London School Board, and only four schools of science. If the higher elementary school is to be a school for general education, it cannot be a school of science. Science may be one of the subjects taught, but it cannot be the preponderant element. In order to justify what I am saying, I shall appeal from the Board of Education to the late Education Department. On November 3rd, 1898, the Science and Art Department forwarded a suggestion by their Inspector that Chelsea "would benefit by the provision of a suitably equipped School of Science." The Education Department, however, sent a Report from their Inspector strongly urging that the school should be designed "also for the teaching of modern languages and commercial training." On March 2nd, 1899, the Education Department forwarded to us a further Memorandum from Her Majesty's Inspector for the Chelsea Division, in which he alludes to "the lack of commercial training and utterly inadequate time given to the only modern language taken" in the higher grade schools in Chelsea. This led to a conference with representatives of the Education Department. Her Majesty's Chief Inspector in his annual Report for 1899 refers to this conference as follows—

> "There was general agreement that in these [higher grade] schools there is a tendency to neglect what may be called the humanities, and to make practical subjects unduly prominent. That this neglect of literary subjects is injudicious is shown by the instance of Scotland, where literary subjects have always been considered of first importance, and yet no one can accuse the Scotch of being imperfectly equipped for the practical work of their lives, or can deny their success in every branch of it—mechanical, commercial, or intellectual."

It is not a Scotsman who says that, but Her Majesty's Chief Inspector in London. A sub-committee of the Technical Education Board of the London County Council came to the same conclusion, after having instituted an inquiry into the needs of commercial education in London. They reported as follows—

> "We are of opinion that it is a question which concerns the citizens of London more than any other British subjects, for London stands alone, as the greatest commercial centre in the world, and as the heart of the British Empire. London has not only a larger proportion of clerks than any other city in the world, it has probably also a larger proportion of clerks to the whole population than most other cities. Everything which affects British trade must affect London in a special degree; and it is only fitting that any measures which are to be taken for the defence of our commercial supremacy should be put forward in the first instance by the merchants and citizens of London."

Therefore in the case of London there is a perfect agreement as to the necessities of general secondary education between Her Majesty's Inspectors, the Technical Education Board, and the London School Board. But, though the London School

Board, complying with the demand of the late Education Department, have established higher elementary schools for instruction in modern languages and commercial subjects, the present Board of Education have limited us to the development of a very scanty number conducted on pure science lines. I cannot understand the educational reason for this action on the part of the Board of Education. What the business houses in London want are clerks who can at least speak fluently one foreign language. If only you begin at an early age this is quite feasible, but this decision of the Board of Education upsets all the measures taken by the London School Board in compliance with the instructions of the Education Department. It does more. It throws the whole burden of our higher grade departments on the rates, in so far as the payment of a block grant constitutes a reduction on the grant we obtained for those schools under the former Code. It virtually cancels the Minute to which I have referred, and instead of giving us higher elementary schools, which we want, forces us to be satisfied with a ridiculously small number of schools, which are only required by a minority of the inhabitants of London. The case of London illustrates that of other centres similarly situated. It discloses, however, a very important misconception, to which the noble Earl behind me has already alluded, which may injuriously affect not only our higher elementary schools, but also our secondary schools. It proceeds from the same mistaken notion which turned technical education committees into secondary education committees under Clause 7 of the Directory of the Science and Art Department. The assumption that the literary side of elementary and of secondary education is less important than its scientific side, and that if you introduce a few literary subjects in a school of science you have satisfied educational demands, is entirely erroneous. It is the result of the neglect of scientific studies in former days and the monopoly enjoyed by classical studies. One side of secondary education is covered by classics. The question at once arises, how much benefit is derived from these studies? If they are pursued with the real aim to master the best thoughts of the Romans and Greeks as expressed in their language, no one will deny their educational value; but in how many instances is this the case? I asked a classical master this question, and he stated that out of every four classical scholars three derived absolutely no benefit from such training, and he was not prepared to grant that of the remaining fourth more than a small proportion were really the better for the time they had spent on Latin and Greek. What is the alternative? That the time wasted on Latin and Greek should be given to English literature and history. There is not to my mind a finer educational instrument than English literature, and that history should be studied in all its ramifications will, I think, need no argument in this House. The result will be that you will give a real education to the large majority of boys who at present get a mere superficial knowledge of the classics, and that they will have been taught subjects which they will assimilate, and which will stimulate them to further exertion. In both cases the education will proceed on literary lines, and in both cases you may add other subjects, but you will have brought these young minds in contact with the best thoughts of superior minds. The neglect of English literature and history may lead to this curious result, that an Englishman meeting a German may find that the latter knows more of English literature and of English history than he knows himself. This question of the relative value of a classical and a modern literary education has been most carefully investigated in France and in Germany. In a recent volume of evidence given before a commission of secondary education, presided over by M. Ribot, a former Premier, in France, such eminent witnesses as M. Poincaré and M. Bourgeois, ex-Ministers of Public Instruction, and M. Gréard and M. Lavirre, stated that modern literature should be placed on the same footing as the classics. The German Emperor put this very forcibly when he said—"I don't want Romans and Greeks; I want Germans." By far the greater number of professions on which young Englishmen enter require a knowledge of modern subjects. You want a general education on modern lines running parallel with a general education on classical lines, and you can include science in either. It would be disastrous to make classics the main feature of a literary education, and science the main

feature of a modern education. Although I have laid great stress on the necessity for a general education because I consider that it is in danger of being overlooked, I am quite aware of the legitimate demand for special instruction, and of the wise impulse given to technical instruction by the noble Duke. We cannot sufficiently develop the higher branches of technical education. The country is, I believe, thoroughly alive to the fact that it has to meet the rivalry of other nations who are constantly adapting their education to ever-varying needs. It is a vital question for our industries and our trade, which depend upon the excellence of our secondary education. It is an Imperial question. What is wanted at the Education Office above all is "the open window," in order to see what is going on elsewhere. In Germany the Emperor is giving to the development of secondary education his constant attention. The expansion of German trade, of German industries, is directly due to the unremitting efforts of the German Government to improve their secondary education. And it is to the general, not to the special education, that their success is mainly due. In France we have the interesting Report of the Commission to which I have alluded. The Report and the evidence show a clear appreciation of all the difficulties of the problem and of the urgent need for reform. Your Lordships are aware of the results of American technological institutes, and how they affect the competition we have to meet. The battle of our trade, of our industries, has to be fought in our schools, in our workshops, and in our scientific laboratories. Will this Bill give us the institutions for general and special secondary education, and for the highest developments of technology? I doubt it. I trust that the Bill will be reintroduced on broader lines, and that it will secure to every part of the country, after a careful survey of the needs of every district—an omission in this Bill which seems to me inexplicable—at least as many opportunities for secondary education as Scotland, Wales, and some of our Colonies enjoy. Indeed, I cannot make out why the Board of Education is not more alive to the necessity of levelling up the English system of education towards that of Scotland. In the next edition of this Bill I hope to find the grants made dependent on approved schemes of general or special instruction; the formation of secondary education committees on lines thoroughly representative of all the educational interests concerned in the various localities; representation secured on the governing bodies of schools which receive public aid; provision for the better use of our educational endowments; the absorption of the educational duties exercised by the Charity Commissioners; the application of the science and art grants to the purposes of the Bill; provision for the training of secondary education teachers, especially in regard to foreign languages; and effect given—which, for some reason or other I cannot fathom, the Bill does not do—to the admirable recommendations of the Royal Commission on Secondary Education. I am deeply convinced that this question of secondary education is one of Imperial importance, a question which bears very closely on our position in the world, and I do not think that in this Bill, which merely touches the fringe of a great question, the Government give satisfaction to what the country asks for and to what the country needs in order to cope with the ever-increasing competition of foreign countries and their increasing efforts to satisfy the demand for improved education.

*THE LORD BISHOP OF HEREFORD: My Lords, after the various interesting speeches to which we have listened I am afraid the House may feel that the subject has been almost sufficiently discussed, and yet, having devoted a large portion of my life to secondary education, I desire to ask the indulgence of the House for a few minutes while I venture to make two or three observations upon the Bill. In the first place, like some of the speakers who have preceded me, I am bound to confess that I feel the Bill to be a somewhat disappointing one, because it is such a very little measure when the urgency of the occasion and the greatness of the subject and of our national needs are considered. Those of us who have occupied ourselves with secondary education have felt for the last thirty years or more how some of the Continental nations were forging ahead of us, and this fact has been brought home more forcibly by reason of the reports which have recently been presented. Whatever this Bill is

called, we have to take it as all that Her Majesty's Government have to offer for the reorganisation of our secondary education system, and, like the noble Lord who has just sat down, I am bound to acknowledge that I cannot understand why the excellent Report of the Royal Commission has been to such a large extent ignored. Before I had the privilege of listening to the debates in this House I was under the impression that it was the habit to take account of the Reports of Royal Commissions, but in the few brief weeks during which I have been a Member of the House I think this is the third Commission's Report which I have seen almost entirely disregarded. When I look at this Bill I am disappointed, in the first place, by the omission of many things which all of us who have been working in secondary education had hoped to see included. Most of those omissions have been already alluded to, but I could not but feel, with the noble Lord, some surprise that nothing is said in this Bill of the use, or the better use, of our educational endowments, and that no sort of power is given to deal with these endowments. From my own practical observation I do not know how any educational committee is to deal thoroughly with this matter in rural or other districts without some such powers. Then again, I must confess a feeling of disappointment that nothing has been done to settle the relations between our elementary and secondary education. I do not mean that I should be prepared to delimit either one or the other, but it is impossible to deal with the practical work of education without feeling that one of the burning questions which must be settled before we can get rid of friction and make real progress is the relation of the higher grade schools to secondary education. But the great omission is the one which was referred to by the noble Lord who has just sat down—namely, that there seems to be no obligation laid on either the local authority or the Central Board even to inquire into the needs of any district. Surely the very first step to be taken, if we are to do any real service in this matter, is to find out the actual needs of this and that county throughout the country. Turning to the provisions of the Bill, I will confine my criticisms to two fundamental clauses. The first of these is Clause 1, the third section of which constitutes the county council the local authority. Here we have one element in the Bill which seems to me, so far as I can judge from my experience, to deserve our unqualified approval, inasmuch as it makes the county the administrative unit. I cannot, however, go along with the clause in handing over the whole of the administration of secondary education to the county councils themselves, subject only to the check of the Central Board. County councils are excellent bodies for many purposes, but I do not suppose they themselves would claim to be educational bodies. If the local authorities are the county councils pure and simple there will be all sorts of variations between one county and another, and I fear there may be some counties in which there will be very little educational work done. I cannot say from my experience, my Lords, that there is a great deal of zeal in the cause of education up and down our rural districts. A good many of our county councils are by no means anxious to spend public money to a large extent on educational work, and so far I cannot feel that they are the proper authorities to be left absolutely paramount and independent in the matter. Something like ten counties which have the administration of what is called the whisky money have not spent by any means the whole of that money on education; and I believe there are about half as many councils of county boroughs which have only spent part of the money on education. I am not blaming those bodies for exercising their legitimate rights, but I cannot but feel that this fact shows that county councils need leavening if we are to form the best sort of education committee for the purpose of this Bill. Therefore I must express my regret that in framing the clause the noble Duke did not take the recommendation of the Royal Commission and say that while the county council should have a bare majority on the education committee the rest should be so elected as to represent the various educational interests and to secure that there should be on every educational Committee men who are really in earnest about the progress of education and who have some real knowledge of the matter. At present, as I understand this clause, there is no sort of guarantee that the education committee of any particular county will have either any interest in,

or any real knowledge of education. The only other clause to which I would refer is the one which was alluded to by his grace the Archbishop of Canterbury. Section 2 of Clause 3 is, as your Lordships are aware, an attempt to solve what is known as the religious difficulty, but I am bound to acknowledge that I do not think it is an attempt which is likely to be very successful. I have the deepest desire to see this religious difficulty got out of the arena of public discussion. I have felt for many years that it has been one of the greatest obstacles to our real educational progress, and now I fear that unless some better clause can be framed than the present one we may import the same difficulty into secondary education. The clause to which I am referring declares that:

"A council in the performance of their duties with respect to education shall not give any preference or advantage to any school on the ground that it does or does not belong to, or is or is not in connection with or under the management of any particular church, sect, or denomination, or that religious instruction is or is not given in the school. Provided that aid shall not be given under this Act to any school in respect of religious instruction."

Now, my Lords, what does that amount to? So far as I can understand the meaning of the clause, it simply amounts to a declaration by which you propose to earmark, so to speak, the aid that is given for this or that school. I am always a little shy of anything in the nature of earmarking in the giving of public grants, and this attempt to earmark aids as only for secular instruction, ignoring the whole question of religious instruction, will be absolutely futile. At any rate, if it is considered sufficient to declare that the public aid given to a public school is given solely for secular instruction, and if that is expected to satisfy public sentiment, I cannot but feel that it should be applied at once to elementary education also. If it is to satisfy public sentiment in regard to secondary education, why should we not be satisfied with it in regard to elementary education, and yet there is no one who will propose it as a settlement of the religious difficulty in our elementary schools. It may be asked, What have I to suggest in place of this? I suggest that the county council, or educational committee of the county council, shall have no power to aid any school on the management of which it is not adequately represented. That I hold to be a fundamental principle which we ought to endeavour to establish through the whole system of our education, and I believe it could be established both with regard to secondary and primary schools without any great amount of difficulty. Having granted this principle, that no aid shall be given to any school on which the county council or the local authority is not adequately represented, I would then be content to say that schools in connection with any particular church or sect or denomination shall be held to be suitable for those pupils who are likely to make use of them, provided, first, that due regard is had to the religious belief of the parents; secondly, that the educational needs of the neighbourhood are duly considered; and, thirdly, that due care is taken that the fees are suitable. I believe that then no further difficulty would be found. I wish to say one word with reference to the clause dealing with private schools under private management. Section 3 of Clause 3 provides that public aid may be given to a school conducted for private profit. I cannot but think that that is a proposal which will require to be carefully watched, to secure that public aid shall not go to increase the dividends of a company. I do not make this criticism as in any way opposed to private schools. My belief is that we should give every encouragement to private enterprise in education as in other matters. My experience has shown that in some cases the very best schools are private schools, and for the reason that a really good private school is generally under the guidance and inspiration of a remarkable man; but my feeling on the whole matter is that, if the private school cannot be so managed as to be on the whole self-supporting, it would be better, in the public interest, that the education should be taken over by the public. In conclusion, I would venture to appeal to the noble Duke to give us a more adequate Bill at the earliest possible opportunity. Having discussed this little Bill, and having decently buried it, I hope that before next session is very old the noble Duke will come forward with such a Bill as he himself would approve. I cannot suppose for a moment that this Bill satisfies the noble Duke. I have had many opportunities of feeling grateful to the noble Duke for the support and assistance he

has given to educational matters. I cannot but express my profound conviction of the urgency of this question. We have been so busy during the last few years in opening up new markets, expanding our Empire, and taking possession of new territories, some of which, I fear, are likely to be hornets' nests, that we have, I am afraid, somewhat overlooked the plain fact—plain to everyone who studies the question—that prosperity in the future will be with the best educated people, and that, if we do not press the question of education more earnestly and more actively, one of the consequences of our extension of Empire will be that the main benefits will be enjoyed by those who belong to better educated countries. I therefore again express the hope that the noble Duke will bring forward a more adequate Bill on the earliest possible occasion next session.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: My Lords, after the discussion which has taken place I will not trouble your lordships with many words, but will confine myself to one or two points. In the first place, I must say that I entirely share with the right rev. Prelate who has just sat down, regret that this is so small a measure ; it is, in point of fact, very little more than a sketch of a measure which is to be filled in by the Education Department afterwards. I wish to say a word upon the very important question as to the authority which is to administer this Bill. I do not like, as it stands, the clause which deals with the local authorities which are to be set up. While I think it quite right that the county councils should be the bodies to whom this work should be entrusted, yet I agree with the right rev. Prelate that it is essential that there should be on the committees which are to manage the affairs of secondary education, men who are educational experts as well as common-sense business men. I should deprecate nothing more than that you should have a committee consisting solely of men of business, or solely of educational experts. Both elements are wanted, the one to correct the other, and I do not by any means give more weight to one than the other. You want common-sense business men, but you also want men who have had long experience of educational questions, for I do not know a subject on which it is more difficult to come to a perfectly clear and satisfactory conclusion. I feel, also, some jealousy of the very extended powers given to the Education Board. It seems to me that in cases where, after full discussion between the county council and the Education Board, no agreement can be come to, it is rather a doubtful matter —though I do not wish to commit myself absolutely to an opinion—that the Education Board should be able to deal with the question and promulgate a scheme without any power of correction by Parliament. I have watched educational discussions through many years, and I know that it is necessary to be extremely careful not to trust absolutely to the Government of the day the settlement of certain questions beyond appeal. You do want, as it were, some power to finally decide a dispute between the Government and the local authorities. It may be that that would be too cumbrous, but in principle I think it would be found to be sound. I feel very strongly with the right rev. Prelate that before a new educational authority is set up in any locality there should be a thorough examination of what the position in that part of the country is. Many of the grammar schools which have done good work in the past are now completely useless, and have ceased to be of any value, the only thing which perpetuates them being the village jealousy not to part with their grammar school. There should be some power to unite these very small schools with some larger school, and so render them more efficient. The mere fact that means of communication are now so much greater than they were has altered the whole aspect of the question. I deeply regret that after years of discussion we are about to take, as far as I can see, no effectual step to make use of the foundations we have already got. I must say a word upon what seems to me to be the most difficult question in this Bill—the question to which the right rev. Prelate referred at the close of his speech. I see in the provisions of this Bill, with the utmost dissatisfaction and even alarm, the repeal of the clause which was in the Technical Education Act giving complete protection to all those who went to denominational schools where the technical grant was applied to aid such schools. That is a step directly backward, a step in the teeth of the old policy of what was

called the Cowper-Temple Clause. I feel the deepest distrust of those opposite to whom I sit on this question, and I see in this an attempt to bring again into discussion the point whether the rates of the country are to be applied, directly or indirectly, to the support of denominational schools, a point on which we know that a strong and bitter feeling exists on both sides. I am not one of those who think that, in the present condition of opinion in the country, we could dispense with denominational schools. Personally, I should like to see them all disappear to-morrow; but, looking at it as a practical man, I must say that that would be a measure fully unjustifiable in the present state of opinion in the country. Many of the denominational schools are excellent educational establishments, and we have to take care that we do not interfere with them in such a way as to destroy their efficiency. I admit that they must take a place in our system, and therefore it is our duty to make them efficient. To stir up this controversy in such a way as to raise a debate on the religious question throughout the country may be useful or not, but it certainly will not tend to the promotion of the object we all have in view—namely, the establishment of an efficient system of secondary education throughout the country. I will put aside the clause which is now about to be repealed, and ask your Lordships whether you have ever considered what the clause is which is in the Welsh Intermediate Education Act. In that Act, which was brought in by the members of the party opposite, what was by no means an unreasonable compromise was adopted. It will be found in the third section of Clause 4 of that Act. It does not interfere with the religious education of boarders in schools, and I do not think you could with propriety interfere in that way with these secondary education schools, many of which are closely connected with some denomination, and where it would be almost impossible to carry on the education as before if you applied a stringent clause to boarders. What the Welsh Intermediate Education Act did was this. It said that "such scheme shall, in addition to the——"

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE: Read the beginning of the section.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: I will read the whole of it. The section is as follows:—

> "Where a scheme under this Act does not relate to a school maintained out of the endowment, or forming part of the foundation, of any cathedral or collegiate church, or where a scheme under this Act does not relate to any other educational endowment which by Section 19 of the Endowed Schools Act, 1869, is excepted from the foregoing provisions of that Act therein mentioned"——

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE: That is, all the denominational schools.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: Not quite, I think.

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE: Yes.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: Then I will give up that argument, which is merely an argument *ad hominem*, and apply myself to the remainder of the section, which, to my mind, suggests a very reasonable solution of the difficulty. The section continues—

> "—such scheme shall, in addition to the provisions of Section 15 of the said Act, provide that no religious catechism or religious formulary which is distinctive of any particular denomination shall be taught to a scholar attending as a day scholar at the school established or regulated by the scheme, and that the times for prayer or religious worship, or for any lesson or series of lessons on a religious subject, shall be conveniently arranged for the purpose of allowing the withdrawal of a day scholar therefrom in accordance with the said Section 15."

I do not think that would be by any means an unreasonable provision—namely, to exempt the day scholars from any interference as regards religious instruction, leaving the boarders to be under the provisions of the scheme which was in force for the management of the school before it was taken over under the present Act. I think that would very likely be acceptable; but in any case I am perfectly sure there must be some kind of compromise if you are to go forward at all. I quite admit the strength of the feeling concerning denominational schools, and I take account of it, but I say you are going backward in this Bill, you are striking out provisions of the Technical Education Act of 1899, and I am not the only person who sees beneath the surface of this Bill a deliberate attempt to pave the way for dealing in a similar manner with elementary education, and any such

attempt will meet with strenuous resistance from the Party to which I belong. Throw down this apple of discord before the country, and you will find there are plenty of people willing to take it up in a manner which would greatly obstruct and hinder the operation of the Bill now before us, which, though a small Bill, may lay the foundation of a larger and wider scheme.

THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (The Duke of DEVONSHIRE): My Lords, I have no right to complain that this discussion has turned upon a very large number of questions, most of which are questions of detail, because I quite admit what has been said by several noble Lords that this Bill is by no means a large one; that it does very little but extend to a certain degree institutions and provisions which already exist, and cannot be regarded as more than a step—an additional step—in the direction of the organisation of secondary education. But the course which the discussion has necessarily taken has had the effect of raising such a very large number of questions of detail, some of them I think rather small details, that I am afraid it will be quite impossible—within any limits which I dare inflict upon your Lordships—to deal with very many of those points which have been raised. My noble friend who began the discussion was very much alarmed that this Bill contemplates the introduction of free secondary as well as elementary education. I do not know where my noble friend finds that in the Bill. He complains that it does not contain any mention of fees to be paid by those who are to receive the education in those schools receiving public aid, but if my noble friend will consider what are the resources at the disposal of the local authorities I think he will see that it is quite impossible that they will be sufficient to meet the cost of any secondary education without considerable assistance in the shape of fees from those who receive it. Those resources are limited to what is sometimes called the drink money, sometimes the whisky money, but what I think I have generally called the local taxation money. That is a considerable but not a very large sum. In addition to that the new authorities will have the disposal of a rate not to exceed 2d. in the pound; and in addition they will have the advantage of endowments of such schools as choose voluntarily to come within their educational schemes. Those resources are not so magnificent as to justify my noble friend in being in the least afraid that any proposal is made under this Bill which will be in the nature of free secondary education. Both my noble friend opposite (Earl Spencer) and the most rev. Prelate who spoke lately complained that this was a very small Bill, and the most rev. Prelate complained that the recommendations of the Report of the Commission had been entirely neglected. My Lords, I have admitted that this neither is nor professes to be a large Bill, but I cannot admit that the recommendations of the Royal Commission have been entirely neglected. I do admit that the Bill does not deal with all the matters which the Secondary Education Commission included in its full and exhaustive Report, but the proposals contained in this Bill are the very steps which were recommended by the Royal Commission, and are in my opinion the necessary preliminary steps to going any further in the direction of carrying out the recommendations of the Secondary Education Commission. The most rev. Prelate and Lord Spencer, and just now Lord Kimberley, complained that the Bill contains no power which will enable the new authorities to deal with educational endowments within their areas. I was under the impression that, under first the Secondary Education Commissioners and then under the Charity Commissioners, a very large number of the educational endowments of the country had already been dealt with.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: By new schemes, yes.

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE: By new schemes, and I cannot imagine anything which is more likely to stimulate action in the same direction, dealing with remaining endowments which have not yet been dealt with, than the constitution in every locality of an educational authority charged with the duty of providing secondary education within their area. But, my Lords, it seems to me, knowing the extreme jealousy with which any interference with local endowments of this kind is met, that we should not have been justified in attempting in

this Bill, the main object of which is to create a new educational authority, to enlarge and make of a far more drastic character those powers which the Charity Commissioners have already felt considerable difficulty in exercising with success. It was suggested that these authorities would have no power even to make inquiry as to the educational provision within their areas. That is entirely a misconception, because these authorities will have power to make all the enquiries which they may think necessary in order to enable them to carry out their duties. Then, my Lords, exception has been taken to the vague manner in which the constitution of the educational authority is provided for, and to the large powers which are reserved to the Board of Education. After a great deal of consideration we came to the conclusion that the difficulties of dealing with the constitution of these authorities in any other manner were almost insuperable. In introducing this Bill I called attention to the fact that the circumstances of different parts of this country differ so much that it is almost impossible to lay down within the limits of a clause the principle upon which these committees should be constituted. It has been admitted, I think, in the discussion to-night that the constitution of a committee must differ in a county from the constitution of that which will be formed in a county borough—that there is an enormous difference between the circumstances of one county and another. One county is mainly agricultural, with one or two large towns in its centre. Other counties are almost entirely consisting of large towns. I only wish that in the interval between this and the next session my noble friends opposite and the most rev. Primate who took exception to the vagueness of this clause will exercise their ingenuity and see whether it is possible for them to draft a clause providing for the constitution of an authority which will not be vehemently resisted by some interest which may consider itself to be ignored or neglected or badly treated. The initiative in framing these schemes will proceed from the county council or the county borough council, but on the Board of Education the responsibility will rest to see that those schemes make proper provision for the adequate representation of interests, educational or otherwise, which, in our judgment, ought to be represented on such a body. Lord Spencer, I think, used the word co-optation. It would be entirely a mistake to suppose that we intended to rely upon co-optation only for the proper constitution of these bodies. The scheme will have to provide, in addition to the appointment of a certain proportion of councillors, for the nomination upon the body of such educational institutions or such non-county boroughs or such districts as upon inquiry we think ought to be represented, and while I am extremely sorry that it should have been found necessary to cast so heavy a responsibility upon the Board of Education, I do not believe that there is any other way in which it would be possible to arrive at a satisfactory mode of their appointment. It was suggested by the most rev. Prelate that there was no power of interference by Parliament with these schemes. Well, I do not see that it would be impossible to provide that these schemes should be laid before both Houses of Parliament, but I admit that I think such a course would probably be attended with very great practical inconvenience. Imagine schemes laid upon the Tables of both Houses providing for the constitution of educational committees for all the counties in England, for all the county boroughs in England, and conceive the opportunities which would be given to every county, every borough, every urban district, every educational authority, which did not consider that it had received sufficient recognition, to bring through their representatives their grievances before one or the other House of Parliament. I am afraid that if this course were adopted the time of both Houses of Parliament would for some time after the passing of this Act be chiefly occupied in the discussion of these questions.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: If the noble Duke will pardon my interrupting him for one moment, I should like to hear his answer to a question which I am afraid I did not express very clearly. I only suggested that where the Education Department and the County Council could not agree, then perhaps there might be an appeal; which, of course, would not involve all the cases.

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE: I was not dealing with that. I was answering the most rev. Prelate the Archbishop of

Canterbury, who suggested that the whole of the schemes ought to be laid before Parliament. It seems to me that the suggestion of the noble Earl opposite in those cases, which no doubt will be extremely exceptional, is one which will be well worthy of consideration.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: I go no further than that.

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE: Now, my Lords, I feel a great deal of difficulty in addressing a very few words to your Lordships upon a subject which unfortunately is almost always introduced into these education discussions, namely, the denominational question. The noble Earl who spoke last said that this was distinctly a retrograde proposal. I think if he will examine the facts he will see that in one sense at all events his own proposal is a retrograde one. He recommended the adoption for day scholars of a universal Cowper-Temple clause. Well, such a provision would exclude the receipt of aid from the county authorities by institutions which are receiving it at present. The noble Earl regrets the disappearance of a certain section of the Technical Instruction Act, but if the noble Earl will refer to a Return which has recently been laid on the Table of the House showing the manner in which local authorities are applying their funds to the purpose of technical education, that Return shows that institutions of a most strictly denominational character are in fact aided out of the rates. Among the institutions so aided are, at Liverpool the St. Francis Xaviers' College, the Catholic Institute, the Convent of Notre Dame at Everton, the Convent of Notre Dame at Mount Pleasant, and the Catholic Male Pupil Teachers' Class.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: That is what we object to.

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE: Is it supposed that institutions of that character would accept a universally applied Cowper-Temple Clause?

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: Do they receive it from the rates, or only from the whisky money?

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE: This is a Return showing the application of the funds at their disposal by the county council.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: Including the penny rate?

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE: Yes. Therefore the principle of my noble friend may be a very right and very excellent one, but certainly in regard to liberality of treatment in denominational schools it is a retrograde one. On the other hand, I understand the most rev. Prelate to object to the provision of a conscience clause in the case of boarding schools. Well, I cannot help thinking that the most rev. Prelate is rather unreasonable in making this demand. He refers to the case of a training college which was recently sanctioned by the Board of Education where, although they were permitted to be without a conscience clause as regards boarders, they were recognised on the condition of making certain provision for day scholars under a conscience clause. In my opinion the case of a training college is altogether distinct from that of such secondary schools as would be aided under this Bill. A denominational training college is maintained by the denomination to which it belongs for the education of the teachers who are to be employed in their own schools. They do not wish—naturally they do not wish—to admit to the college any others but teachers of their own denomination. That is the object for which the training college is established. But no such exclusion prevails in the case of our great secondary schools. I believe that in the case of Eton and Harrow and our other great public schools Roman Catholics, Nonconformists, and Jews are admitted to those schools, and no difficulty is found in the management of Eton and Harrow and other public schools in making provision for absolutely respecting the consciences of those boys of other denominations, while not interfering in the least degree with their own freedom in religious instruction as regards those of their own denomination. And I do not see why it should be considered any hardship in the case of schools desiring to come under educational schemes supported and aided by the county councils, to impose upon them conditions which in practice are not found difficult of observance in such schools as Eton and Harrow. My Lords, no doubt this question will be debated at very great

length and with some warmth in the country. I cannot help, however, expressing my own belief that any such provision as has been suggested by the noble Earl opposite, that is to say the imposition of a Cowper-Temple Clause upon any school desiring to receive aid from this scheme, would exclude from co-operation a very large number of admirable denominational schools, the services of which the educational authority will probably be most anxious to obtain, and that therefore we should be for perfectly unnecessary reasons excluding ourselves from one of the best and most fruitful sources of educational supply. My noble friend Lord Reay made a speech in which I am afraid it is quite impossible for me on the present occasion to follow him. The substance of that speech was to invite me to give a reply to a very long letter on a very important subject which had been addressed by the London School Board to the Board of Education. That letter I had not seen until by the courtesy of the noble Lord I received notice of the question which he proposed to raise upon this occasion. Of course I have not yet had the opportunity of consulting my advisers in the Education Board, and the subject is one of much too great importance to make it possible for me to give an answer either to the noble Lord's speech or to that letter without a great deal of further consideration. The working, the administration, of the new higher elementary school grant is a matter of very great importance, and probably will be one of very considerable difficulty, and I think it would be extremely undesirable that on an occasion of this kind I should commit myself prematurely either in support or in rejection of the views which have been urged upon us by the London School Board. On the denominational question perhaps I ought to add that while I consider the objection of the most rev. Prelate to the conscience clause to be somewhat unreasonable, and one which I do not think can be entertained, while I believe that the suggestion of the noble Earl opposite would most unfortunately limit the educational resources to which it would be in our power to look, I must leave to both the noble Earl opposite and the most rev. Prelate the duty of determining whether the solution of this difficult question which was proposed by the Bishop of Hereford will meet the views of either of them. I am afraid that there are a very large number of excellent denominational schools which would resent a legislative provision which would compel them to accept the representation of a public authority upon their governing body, although I have no doubt that it will not be difficulty in the great majority of cases to make voluntary arrangements with the council by which the educational authority will be represented on such governing bodies. On the other hand, I doubt very much whether the anti-denominational friends of the noble Earl opposite would be satisfied with merely that provision enabling the county authority to aid whatever denominational schools it chose, provided they had representation upon the governing body. I am afraid, my Lords, that this is a subject which is a great deal too difficult, and which has in times past aroused too much controversy, to make it capable of very easy solution in any of the ways which have been suggested to-night. The Government have produced what they thought to be a reasonable solution, and I hope that when it comes to be further considered it will not meet with the embittered opposition of which I have heard for the first time from the noble Earl opposite to-night.

On Question, agreed to.

Bill read 2ª accordingly.

INDIAN FAMINE IRRIGATION WORKS.

*LORD KINNAIRD: My Lords, in rising to ask the Under Secretary of State for India whether he will give a list of the irrigation and other works for the prevention of famine undertaken since the last famine in 1897, and the cost thereof; also of the large works approved as being necessary previous to 1897 which have not been undertaken owing to want of surplus revenue, notwithstanding the fact that they are expected to be remunerative, and that money can be borrowed at a lower rate than works are expected to yield, I think everyone may feel hopeful that we are now near the time when the pressure of famine will begin to pass, and the Government will be free to consider what steps may be taken to prevent future famine in certain districts unprovided with water. I will not enter at this time into the thorny questions on which there is so much difference of opinion with reference to what can be

done and whether we fail to utilise the water which Providence gives to us, and of which I believe more than three-fourths' if not a great deal more, is not utilised, and whether large works might be carried on with any advantage, as has been done in some districts where certain authorities in old times said it was impossible to take advantage of water not far off by means either of irrigation canals or the storage of water by means of dams. Then the second part of my question raises, I think, an important point, namely, whether it is desirable to stop an important work simply because revenue may fail when it has been agreed by all the authorities that the work is desirable. It seems to some laymen in this matter, that when the Government can borrow at a low rate of interest and hope within a short time not only for a return on the work but also increase of revenue, when the next revenue assessment comes to be made the work ought not to be stopped by want of ready money, and I feel confident that there are many in both Houses of Parliament who would be willing, supposing the Indian Government were not able to further their own resources, to find large sums for this purpose to make even a liberal grant from the Imperial Exchequer in the way of a free loan, with proper conditions for repayment when the work became remunerative. I will not further detain your Lordships. I have to ask the noble Lord the question of which I have given notice.

*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (The Earl of ONSLOW): I think from the nature of the question which the noble Lord has put to me that he has not quite rightly appreciated the practice of the Government of India in apportioning the money for the purpose of carrying out irrigation. There are three kinds of irrigation works carried out by the Government of India. First of all, there are what are known as the major works. Those are paid for out of borrowed moneys and are expected to be, and as a matter of fact are, remunerative. Then there are what are known as minor works. Those as a rule are smaller works which are constructed not out of capital, but out of revenue. In some cases those also are remunerative. Then there are what are known as protective works. These are paid for out of the famine fund, which, as the noble Lord knows, is a fund set apart every year by the Government of India for the purpose of protection against famine. They would not be constructed at all were it not for protective purposes, although it occasionally turns out that they also are remunerative. Of all those works, if the noble Lord wishes it, I can give a return, but they can already be found in different papers which have been laid on the table of both Houses of Parliament. As regards the second part of the question the noble Lord seems to think that some of the irrigation works in India are likely to be suspended owing to lack of funds arising from revenue; but, as I have already told him the major works, the more important works, are paid for out of borrowed money and not out of revenue at all, and I am not at all aware that there is any ground for the suggestion which seems to be contained in the question that the expenditure on irrigation works has been cut down during recent years owing to the famine. On the contrary, the provision for irrigation works has been steadily increasing in recent years. In 1898-99, the total expenditure was £453,047, in 1899-1900 it was £622,733, while the Budget estimate for the current year is £708,200. A paper has been laid on the Table of your Lordships' House called "The Explanatory Memorandum of the Secretary of State," explanatory of the Budget statement which he will make in another place in the course of a few days, and the noble Lord will there find a statement of the irrigation works which are about to be carried out. But I think there is a little misapprehension in the minds of many people as to the amount of the irrigation work which is being carried on. Not less than nineteen millions of acres are already under irrigation in India and twenty-five and a half millions of money have been spent, and as a matter of fact there is very little fresh ground in the whole of India where irrigation works could be constructed with any advantage. The Viceroy has been giving great attention to this question and he has come to the conclusion that all that the Government of India could spend, however much money they might have, would be something like ten lakhs a year, and that would probably about double the area of 300,000 acres which is covered by work of a purely protective character at the present time. So the total practicable increase of the irrigable area in India under both heads of irrigation works

cannot amount to much more than four million acres. The Viceroy hopes to lay down a permanent scheme and a continuous policy for carrying out irrigation works in India, and so far as the cost and the money to be raised for carrying them out is concerned, I think the noble Lord need have no apprehension that that amount will fall off in years to come, because, as he is well aware, the major works—most of the irrigation works in India—are extremely remunerative and therefore capital can be advantageously borrowed for the purpose of making them, and it is the intention of the Government of India to continue carrying them on at as rapid a pace as is consistent with the nature of the work, and they believe that in the course really of a comparatively short period all the land in India which is capable of irrigation will be dealt with.

BEER RETAILERS' AND SPIRIT GROCERS' LICENCES (IRELAND) (No. 2) BILL.

Amendments reported (according to Order). Further Amendments made; and Bill to be read 3ª.

COPYRIGHT BILL [H.L.].

Order of the day for the House to be put into Committee read.

*LORD MONKSWELL: In moving that the House do resolve itself into Committee, I am afraid that I shall have to make one or two observations upon the Bill. On the second reading I stated that the Bill in its then condition as drafted by Lord Thring was a tentative measure, and your Lordships will not be surprised to hear that it has undergone considerable modification in Committee. One object of the Committee was to simplify the law by assimilating it in all cases of artistic work. To a great extent this Bill does simplify the law, for as regards various important matters the law is made the same with regard to all artistic work. For instance, every kind of artistic work will have the same term of copyright, that is to say, during the life of the author and thirty years after, and copyright will be attracted to all artistic works, whether made by subjects of the Queen or by anybody else, and wherever they are made. There is no restriction either as to the person who can obtain copyright or where the artistic work is to be made. Again, in no case will registration be necessary to attract copyright. Now, my Lords, in all these particulars the Bill has undergone no change in Committee, but a further and very difficult question arose with regard to artistic copyright, and that is as to the respective rights of the author and the owner of artistic works in default of any agreement as to what those rights should be. This was a question very much discussed in 1878 both by and before the Copyright Commission, and by a bare majority of one it was recommended that on sale, in the absence of agreement, copyright should pass to the owner of the work, and not remain in the artist. This recommendation was vigorously assailed by the whole body of artists. It was contended that subject to certain restrictions in favour of the buyer the copyright should remain with the artist. The Select Committee has taken a good deal of fresh evidence on this matter, both oral and written, and they have bestowed much thought and labour on the question, and they have arrived at definite conclusions as to the principles on which the Legislature should proceed. But the drafting details are exceedingly technical. I am not at all sure that everything is covered; in fact, I am quite prepared to hear that the Bill leaves a great deal to be desired in the matter of drafting details; but as the Bill cannot pass this session the Committee do not attach very much importance to this defect in detail. It is submitted not as a measure that has been carefully thought out in every detail, but as containing the main provisions of a just settlement of the respective claims of artists and those who deal with them. The Committee have adjusted the claims on somewhat different lines according to the nature of the artistic work. The Committee place the painter and the draughtsman in one class, the sculptor in another, and the photographer in a third. With regard to painters and draughtsmen, with respect to portraits painted on commission the Committee propose to leave the law as it stands at present; that is to say, the person giving the commission and not the artist will enjoy the copyright, but as to all other pictures painted on commission the artists' contention has been adopted by the Committee in its entirety, and the law has been altered by retaining copyright in the artist, and not transferring it to the person

giving the commission. Further, where a picture is not sold on commission, but is sold out of a studio, the artist, according to this Bill, is to retain the copyright on a sale in the absence of agreement. The law at present is that the artist loses the copyright on sale, and in the absence of agreement the buyer does not get it, so it becomes lost. We propose that it shall go to the artist. Now, copyright of the artist is in all cases subject to a proviso against making or authorising replicas against the wish of the owner of the painting. Replica is defined to be a copy so like the original as to be calculated to deceive an ordinary observer. So much for the painters and draughtsmen. Now I come to the sculptors. The sculptor hitherto, unlike the painter, has been the spoilt child of legislation. The sculptor enjoys privileges that artists in their wildest dreams would never think of asking for. Their copyright is absolute, and it is subject to no restriction at all in favour of the purchaser. Busts, statues, ornamental work of every kind, even when executed on commission and only for private use, can be copyrighted by the sculptor without consulting the owner at all. The Committee had before them the celebrated sculptor Mr. Brock, and he told them that no sculptor of repute would think himself justified in making the replicas of sculpture intended only for use in private houses unless the owner gave leave. The Committee have decided to make the law conform to the practice and to prohibit replicas of sculpture made on commission except where the work is intended to be located in some public place. With regard to photographs, what the Committee propose is this: that copyright not only in portraits, but in all photographs made on commission, shall belong to the person giving the commission. I think the only other thing I need say is that provisions have been introduced for the detection and for the punishment of infringement of copyright that are quite sufficiently stringent. I ought to say in conclusion that I do not propose to carry the Bill beyond its present stage. I propose to have it printed and circulated for criticism during the vacation, and I have to ask your Lordships' leave to make one alteration in Committee in this Bill. It is a drafting alteration. By some error two alternative subsections have been put into this Bill which are not intended to stand together, and what I hope your Lordships will agree to is to strike out one of those subsections in Committee.

Lord Monkswell.

House in Committee (according to Order). The Amendments proposed by the Select Committee made.

A further Amendment made; and Bill re-committed to the Standing Committee; and to be printed as amended. (No. 206.)

TITHE RENT-CHARGE (IRELAND) BILL.

House in Committee (according to Order).

Clauses 1 to 8 amended, and agreed to.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR OF IRELAND (Lord ASHBOURNE): I understand that some of my noble friends from Ireland consider that the new clause I propose to move is open to objection. I have intimated to my noble friends that I propose to take the Report stage on Thursday, and I understand they agree that it will be convenient that I should now just state the object of the new clause, and that they should reserve their opposition until we get to the Report stage. I can state very briefly the purport of this Amendment. The Bill dealt with a state of facts which had taken away and left non-existing all powers of revision of ecclesiastical tithe. I confine myself to that for the purpose of this sub-section. At the time when that was the state of the law in Ireland, power was given to the Land Commission that they might of themselves permit a redemption of tithe without any authorisation from the Treasury at twenty years purchase instead of twenty-two and a half. It was suggested in the House of Commons by the Chief Secretary that, the circumstances changing, and the power of revision being resumed, and a substantial reduction in the tithe being the obvious result, it would be only reasonable from the Treasury standpoint, the Executive standpoint, to restore to the Treasury the power of deciding whether they would adhere to the period of 22½ years or take a lesser number of years purchase. The Amendment which I propose merely seeks to restore that power, under the altered circumstances, to the Treasury. By the Irish Land Act of 1896, there

being then no power of revising, and therefore no power of reducing tithes, power was given to the Land Commission of themselves to accept twenty years purchase, and no longer was the consent of the Treasury needed for that particular operation of taking less than 22½ years purchase. But now, when tithes are going to be largely and substantially reduced, the Treasury and the Executive think it reasonable that there should not be a reduction on both sides, and that, if there is an absolute power of reduction in the amount of the tithe, it is reasonable to give again to the Treasury the right to be heard on the question whether less than 22½ years shall be taken. I am aware that that does not commend itself to my noble friends, but perhaps they will allow the Amendment to go through now, and raise their objections on the Report stage.

*THE EARL OF MAYO assented to that suggestion, and said he would put down Amendments to this clause for the Report stage.

Amendment moved—

"In page 4, after Clause 8, to insert the following new clause: '9. Sub-section 1 of Section 37 of the Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1896 (which dispenses with the consent of the Treasury to the redemption of tithe rent-charge as therein mentioned) shall not have effect in the case of any tithe rent-charge to which Section 3 of this Act applies.'"—(*Lord Ashbourne.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Remaining clauses amended, and agreed to.

Bill re-committed to the Standing Committee; and to be printed as amended. (No. 207.)

IRISH FISHERIES—INSPECTORS' REPORTS.

*THE EARL OF MAYO, who had on the Paper the following question—

"To ask Her Majesty's Government if the Inspectors of Irish Fisheries held inquiries in Limerick, Killaloe, and Athlone on 30th January, 1st February, and 3rd February, 1900; and if the Limerick Board of Conservators applied on 28th March to the Irish Government for a copy of their Report thereon; and if the Irish Government refused it. That as a Bill is now before the House dealing with the matter, will the Government lay the Report upon the Table, or allow those interested in the Bill to see the Report"—

said: It may be in the recollection of your Lordships' House that I moved the rejection of a Bill called the Shannon Water and Electric Power Bill. That was a Bill affecting very materially the fisheries in the River Shannon. The Inspectors of Irish Fisheries held an inquiry in Limerick, and it was most important that those interested in the Bill should know the result, but for some reason the Report had been held back. There is a strong suspicion that the Inspectors of Fisheries reported that the Bill would be most harmful to the fisheries, and it would be of great advantage if the Report could be laid on the Table.

THE EARL OF DENBIGH: The Report of the Inspectors of Irish Fisheries on the subject of the works proposed to be carried out by the Shannon Water and Electrical Power Company was prepared for the information of the Government, and it would be contrary to official usage to publish it. For this reason the application made by the Limerick Board of Conservators for a copy of the Report was refused, as was also a similar application made by the promoting company; and a like objection exists to the publishing of the Report as a Parliamentary Paper, or to any other form of publication. The Government therefore regret that they are unable to comply with the request of the noble Earl.

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES ACT (1890) AMENDMENT BILL.

House in Committee (according to Order); Amendments made; Bill re-committed to the Standing Committee; and to be printed as amended. (No. 208.)

PROHIBITION OF EXPORTATION OF ARMS BILL [H L.].

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (The Earl of HALSBURY): My Lords, I think my best exposition of this Bill will be to read to your Lordships the only operative clause of it, which is—

"It shall be lawful for Her Majesty by proclamation to prohibit the exportation of arms, ammunition, and military and naval stores to

any country or place therein named whenever Her Majesty shall judge such prohibition to be expedient in order to prevent such arms, ammunition, military or naval stores being used against Her Majesty's subjects or forces, or against any forces engaged or which may be engaged in military or naval operations in co-operation with Her Majesty's forces."

I believe the circumstances of the time are such that there is no one who can read those words without seeing what they are pointed at—the absolute necessity of being able by law to prohibit the exportation of arms, ammunition, military or naval stores, which, though exported from this country, may be used in aid of Her Majesty's enemies. That, my Lords, is the whole scope and object of the Bill, and I am quite sure your Lordships will be glad to give it a Second Reading.

Bill read 2ª (according to Order), and committed to a Committee of the whole House to-morrow.

SOUTH AFRICA — SETTLEMENT OF SOLDIERS IN THE ORANGE RIVER COLONY AFTER THE WAR.

LORD WOLVERTON: I beg to ask Her Majesty's Government, whether, in view of the many applications already made, they can give this House an assurance that they are preparing, or have in contemplation, some scheme by which soldiers, either time-expired or otherwise, can settle under advantageous circumstances in the Orange River Colony.

*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (The Earl of SELBORNE): My Lords, this question has never been lost sight of for one moment by Her Majesty's Government, who have been, as was stated by Mr. Chamberlain in the House of Commons more than a month ago, in constant communication with Sir Alfred Milner on the subject. The matter has been referred to an inter-Departmental Committee, comprising representatives of the War Office, the Treasury, and the Colonial Office, and this Committee has already begun to sit. I hope, therefore, before long to be in a position to lay all the facts of the case before Her Majesty's Government. I cannot say more at the present moment except that the matter is receiving and will receive our most earnest consideration, but it is one in which obviously any steps that may be taken demand the most careful and thorough consideration.

LORD WOLVERTON: I think it would give confidence in the country if my noble friend would state who is the chairman of the Committee.

THE EARL OF SELBORNE: I am not in a position to state that.

House adjourned at a quarter past Eight of the clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten of the clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 23rd July, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [Lords] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz.:—

Sunderland Corporation Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS [Lords] (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz.:—

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 3) Bill [Lords].

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 4) Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time To-morrow.

HASTINGS TRAMWAYS BILL.

LAMBETH WATER BILL.

LANCASHIRE, DERBYSHIRE, AND EAST COAST RAILWAY BILL.

Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

BURY AND DISTRICT WATER (TRANSFER) BILL [Lords].

Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

BARNSLEY CORPORATION BILL [Lords].

DUBLIN, WICKLOW, AND WEXFORD RAILWAY BILL [Lords].

As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

LONDON, WALTHAMSTOW, AND EPPING FOREST RAILWAY (ABANDONMENT) BILL.

Not amended, considered.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed.

NORTH BRITISH RAILWAY BILL [Lords].

As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

PRESTON CORPORATION BILL [Lords].

As amended, considered; Amendments made.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

RAMSGATE CORPORATION IMPROVEMENTS BILL [Lords].

ROTHERHITHE AND RATCLIFF TUNNEL BILL [Lords].

As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

BOURNEMOUTH CORPORATION BILL [Lords].

Read a second time, and committed.

CRYSTAL PALACE COMPANY BILL [Lords].

Read a second time, and committed.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 211 and 236 be suspended, and that the Committee on the Bill have leave to sit and proceed forthwith.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

BROMPTON AND PICCADILLY CIRCUS RAILWAY BILL.

Order [12th February] referring the Brompton and Piccadilly Circus Railway Bill to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

BUENOS AYRES AND ROSARIO RAILWAY BILL [Lords].

Ordered, That Standing Orders 211 and 236 be suspended, and that the Committee on the Buenos Ayres and Rosario Railway Bill [Lords] have leave to sit and proceed forthwith.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

COSTA RICA RAILWAY COMPANY, LIMITED, BILL [Lords].

Ordered, That Standing Orders 211 and 236 be suspended, and that the Committee on the Costa Rica Railway Company, Limited, Bill [Lords] have leave to sit and proceed forthwith.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

ROE'S PATENT BILL [Lords].

Ordered, That Standing Orders 211 and 236 be suspended, and that the Committee on Roe's Patent Bill [Lords] have leave to sit and proceed forthwith.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 1) BILL.

PIER AND HARBOUR PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 2) BILL.

Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

TRAMWAYS ORDERS CONFIRMATION (No. 1) BILL [Lords].

As amended, considered; to be read the third time To-morrow.

EDUCATION BOARD PROVISIONAL ORDER CONFIRMATION (LONDON) BILL [Lords].

Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Order confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered To-morrow.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to — Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders.

(No. 3) Bill; Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (Housing of Working Classes) Bill; Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (Housing of Working Classes) (No. 2) Bill, without amendment.

That they have agreed to Amendments to—Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [Lords], Whitechapel and Bow Railway Bill [Lords], Exmouth Urban District Water Bill [Lords], Gwyrfai Rural District Council Water Bill [Lords], without amendment.

PETITIONS.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

Two Petitions from Ryton-on-Tyne, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (No. 2) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Swalwell; Dunston-on-Tyne (two); New Washington; and Usworth Colliery; to lie upon the Table.

SUNDAY CLOSING (MONMOUTHSHIRE) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Dunston-on-Tyne; Blaydon; Winlaton; Hedgefield; Crawcrook; Rowlands Gill; Blaydon Haughs; and Usworth Colliery; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

RAILWAYS (CONTINUOUS BRAKES).

Copy presented, of Return by Railway Companies of the United Kingdom for the six months ending the 31st December, 1899 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

UNIVERSITIES (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1889.

Copy presented, of General Report of the Commissioners under the Universities (Scotland) Act, 1889, with an Appendix containing Ordinances, Minutes, Correspondence, Evidence, and other Documents [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

SHEBEENS IN TOWNS (IRELAND).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 6th July; *Mr. Macaleese*]; to lie upon the Table.

EAST INDIA (FAMINE).

Copy presented, of Advances and Gifts to Agriculturists for Seed, Cattle, and Subsistence at the End of the Famine [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

POST OFFICE TELEGRAPHS (REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE).

Return ordered, "of Revenue and Expenditure of the Post Office for each year from 1869–70 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 319, of Session 1899), and an Estimate for the same for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1900, in the following form:—

Year.	Revenue.			Expenditure.														
	Telegraph receipts.	Extra receipts.	Estimated value of services to other Departments.	Total.	Sites and Buildings.		Telegraph extension.	Superannuation and other non-effective charges.	Salaries, wages, &c.	Percentage of salaries, wages, &c., to total Revenue.	Maintenance of telegraph system.	Percentage of maintenance of telegraph system to total Revenue.	Other Expenditure.		Total Expenditure.	Percentage of total Expenditure to total Revenue.	Net Revenue.	Net Revenue after deducting Columns 5, 6, and 7.	Interest on stock created for purchase of telegraphs.
					Purchase.	Erection.							Under Telegraph Vote.	Under other Votes.					
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		10		11	12	13		14	15	16

—(*Mr. Hanbury.*)

POST OFFICE (REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE).

Return ordered, "of Revenue and Expenditure of the Post Office for each year from 1869–70 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 320, of Session 1899), and an Estimate of the same for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1900, in the following form:—

Year.	Revenue.				Expenditure.													
					Sites and Buildings.							Other Expenditure.						
	Postal receipts.	Extra receipts.	Estimated value of services to other departments.	Total.	Purchase.	Erection.	Superannuations and other non-effective charges.	Salaries, wages, &c.	Percentage of salaries, &c. to total Revenue.	Conveyance of mails.	Percentage of conveyance of mails to total Revenue.	Packet service.	Under Post Office Vote.	Under other Votes.	Total Expenditure.	Percentage of Total Expenditure to total Revenue.	Net Revenue.	Net Revenue, after deducting Columns 5 and 6.
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		9		10	11	12	13		14	15

—(*Mr. Hanbury.*)

UNIVERSITIES (SCOTLAND).

Return ordered, "of the amount of Class Fees paid by Students attending each of the Universities of Scotland, showing for each University the various Faculties, the Class Subjects, the number of Students at the respective Classes, and the amount of Fees paid for instruction at these respective Classes, according to the following form:—

Name of University._____

Name of Faculty._____

Name of Class.	Students.						Class Fees.					
	Winter Session, 1899–1900.			Summer Session, 1900.			Winter Session, 1899–1900.			Summer Session, 1900.		
	Men.	Women.	Total.	Men.	Women.	Total.	Men.	Women.	Total.	Men.	Women.	Total.
							£	£	£	£	£	£

with Summaries showing the total number of students and amounts of fees respectively in each Faculty and each University; and also grand totals for Scottish Universities."—(*Mr. Thomas Shaw.*)

QUESTIONS.

CHINA—ANTI-FOREIGN OUTBREAK—POSITION AT PEKING — RECENT NEWS.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): I beg to ask the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs whether there is anything to communicate to the House about China.

THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): We have very little in the way of news from China, but perhaps the House would like to hear the statements made to us with regard to the safety of the Legations at Peking. A communication has been received at the Foreign Office from the Chinese Minister to the effect that the Legations were un-

harmed, and we have received from Shanghai a translation of an Imperial Decree, dated July 18th, as follows—

"In the Confucian work 'Spring and Autumn,' it is written that Envoys shall not be killed. How can it then be supposed that the Throne's policy is to connive at allowing the troops and populace to vent their wrath upon the foreign Ministers? Excepting the murder of the German Minister by the riotous people, which offence is being vigorously investigated, the other Ministers are being protected for a month past by the Throne with a ceaseless energy, and fortunately have suffered (? group omitted) harm."

A telegram was received on Friday at Shanghai from the Governor of Shantung transmitting a cypher message from the United States Minister to his Government, which purported to have left Peking on July 18th. This message was undated and was to the effect that the United States Minister was in the British Legation under fire from shot and shell. The date given by the Chinese to the United States Minister's telegram is the same as that of the above decree, and the assurances of safety contained in the decree are not borne out by the latter. The Consul General telegraphed to the Governor of Shantung asking how it was that a message from Peking could reach Chinan-Fu in two days, and why we had had no message from Sir Claude MacDonald. The reply was as follows—

"The United States Minister's telegram was sent by Tsung-li Yamen by a messenger travelling 600 li (roughly 200 miles) a day. I assure you there is no telegraphic communication. I cannot explain why Her Majesty's Minister has not telegraphed. But I beg you not to be anxious, for the Ministers and others are all living and unharmed; of this I have already had several reliable messages."

Seeing that over a month has elapsed since any communication has reached Her Majesty's Government from the Peking Legation, and that the Tsung-li Yamen are communicating by messenger with various Chinese authorities, Her Majesty's Government feel that they cannot attach credence to any statements or decrees attributed to the Emperor or the Chinese Government unless fortified by letters signed and dated by Sir Claude MacDonald or other British official, or by telegrams in our cypher.

THE YANG-TSZE VICEROYS.

MR. YERBURGH (Chester): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Foreign Office have received a letter from the China Association urging that what the position in the Yang-tsze region requires is not only promise of help to the great provincial officials in putting down possible disturbance, but a clear and explicit expression of the intention of Her Majesty's Government to uphold and protect in their persons, properties, and offices those who have ventured to range themselves on the side of order and loyalty to their obligations; and whether, in view of this expression of opinion, and the pressure which is notoriously being brought to bear upon the great Viceroys of the Yang-tsze region and others, Her Majesty's Government are now prepared to give them the explicit assurances required.

MR. BRODRICK: Her Majesty's representatives have been in constant communication with the Yang-tsze Viceroys, and the assurances they have asked for have been given.

MR. YERBURGH: Has the Foreign Office received the letter from the China Association?

MR. BRODRICK: I believe the letter has been received.

CHINESE REPRESENTATIVES IN THIS COUNTRY.

MR. HEDDERWICK (Wick Burghs): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether it is in accordance with ordinary diplomatic usages that, while our countrymen are being massacred in China, the representatives of the Government of China in this country should be invited to, and received as honoured guests at, State and official functions; and whether Her Majesty's Government intend to take any steps to indicate to the representatives of China in this country their views with regard to recent events in China.

MR. BRODRICK: The answer to the hon. Member's question depends on the state of facts at Peking, with which, as I have already told the House, we are imperfectly acquainted. Her Majesty's Government have not failed to take every measure in their power to bring home to the Chinese Government their views as to recent events in China.

EXPORTS OF MUNITIONS OF WAR TO CHINA.

COLONEL PILKINGTON (Lancashire, Newton): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether the Government have come to any decision with regard to stopping the export of arms and ammunition from this country to China for the use of the Chinese; and, if so, whether he will communicate the nature of such decision to the House; and whether any ironclads, torpedo boats, or other vessels of war are now being constructed for the Chinese by British firms, or are in course of transit from British builders to the Chinese; and, if so, whether the Government intend to stop these vessels, either on the water or in the building yards.

*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): This question should be addressed to the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs. My hon. and gallant friend must be aware that a Bill has been introduced in another place to effect this object.

PEKING LEGATION—NAVAL GUARD.

*SIR J. COLOMB (Great Yarmouth): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he is aware that a list of non-commissioned officers and men of the German Marines, under Count Goben, who were sent up to Peking to guard the German Legation, was published some days ago in Germany; and if he can explain why this cannot be done in the case of British Marines, under Captain Halliday, who were sent up to Peking to guard the British Legation.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. GOSCHEN, St. George's, Hanover Square): The Commander-in-Chief has not up till now reported the names of the men forming the Marine Guard at Peking; we have telegraphed to him to do so. He has not yet sent the information.

PROVISION FOR THE SICK AND WOUNDED IN CHINA—HOSPITAL SHIP PRESENTED BY MAHARAJAH OF GWALIOR.

MR. HEDDERWICK: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs what has been done to provide for the proper care of the British wounded at Tientsin and Ta-ku; and whether there is any hospital accommodation at Wei-hai-wei.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord G. HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): Her Majesty's Government have no special information as to the arrangements made at the front for the wounded in the recent engagements; but there were available the medical staffs of the various British men-of-war under Admiral Seymour, and General Dorward took with him other medical officers and appliances. As regards hospital accommodation at Wei-hai-wei, there is a good hospital on the island, and good stone barracks convertible to hospital use if wanted. General Gaselee has telegraphed that as soon as he reaches Wei-hai-wei, he will report on its suitability for the location of base hospitals. The water supply in the island is good and ample. To this I have to add that the Government of India have already provided a hospital ship, and are prepared to supplement this accommodation by converting three transports into hospital ships. The American hospital ship "Maine" has also been placed at the disposal of Her Majesty's Government, and I am glad to take this opportunity of expressing our gratitude for this great act of generosity to the Atlantic Transport Company, which has furnished the ship, and to the American ladies who have provided the funds for equipping and maintaining it. I have also to inform the House that I have received from the Maharajah Sindhia of Gwalior the offer of a fully equipped hospital ship for China, upon which he is willing to spend twenty lakhs. This princely offer is made on behalf of himself, his mother, and his wife, to testify their loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen Empress. Her Majesty's Government have expressed their acceptance of this most munificent offer, and their deep appreciation of the motives which actuated His Highness to make it.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL ARRANGEMENTS—COMMISSION OF INQUIRY.

COLONEL WYNDHAM MURRAY (Bath): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the instructions to the Commission of Inquiry into the medical arrangements in South Africa will include the making of a thorough inquiry on the

spot by the medical members of the Commission into the results of inoculation for enteric fever, in preventing the disease, or lessening its effects.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): The inquiry to which my hon. and gallant friend refers, though doubtless one of very great importance, appears to be outside the scope of reference of the Commission, and it would require somewhat different circumstances to investigate a purely scientific medical subject of the kind suggested.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether Mr. Harrison, who has been appointed a member of the South African Hospitals Commission, holds an appointment as member of the Army Railway Council, a body which advises the Army authorities in matters of railway transport and engineering, and has the rank of lieutenant-colonel in the Army; and will he state in whom is the appointment to seats in the Army Railway Council vested, and was that council, of which Mr. Harrison is a member, consulted in the matter of railway transport in South Africa, which will form one branch of the subject matter of the inquiries of the South African Hospital Commission, of which Mr. Harrison is also a member.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I believe he is not a lieutenant-colonel in the Army. He is, however, a member of the Army Railway Council, an unpaid body called into existence at the request of a Departmental Committee of experts in order to advise the War Office, not on anything connected with South Africa or South African transport, but simply on the question of transports and mobilisation within the four quarters of the United Kingdom.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: By whom are the appointments made?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: They are made by the War Office, of course. Whom else could they be made by?

PUBLICATION OF DESPATCHES.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can now state definitely that the South African war despatches already asked for will be in the hands of Members before the House is asked to consider the Supplementary Estimates for war services in South Africa.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not myself think that these despatches have any direct connection with the Estimates to be introduced by my hon. friend the Under Secretary for War, but I frankly admit I should be very glad to lay the despatches on the Table, and I had hoped that by the time the Estimates would be discussed we might have considered that the operations of the war were at an end, or practically at an end, in which case it would be possible to lay them at once. That, however, appears to be a sanguine estimate, and I do not quite see how it is possible now to lay the despatches on the Table in view of the opinion expressed by the right hon. Gentleman and others on both sides of the House that anything which contains commentary upon military operations going on or the discretion of officers engaged should not be published while those military operations are in progress.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I cannot enter into a controversy on the subject now, but I must firmly protest against any such sentiment being attributed to me.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

CAPTAIN DONELAN (Cork, E.): On behalf of the hon. Member for North Kerry, I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can state approximately the amount of money to be asked for in the Supplementary Estimate in connection with the war in South Africa; and also approximately what portion of the estimated gross cost of the war in South Africa will Ireland have to contribute.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It is impossible at present, I think, and certainly premature, to give any estimate of the kind asked for. As for the Supplementary Estimate which is to be brought forward, that will be in the hands of Members to-day or to-morrow, and, probably, it would be better for the House to wait till they have the estimate in their hands than for me to attempt to give any account of its contents. I may, however, say that some

of the rumours I have seen published as to the magnitude of the financial operations contemplated by the Government are altogether fantastic in their proportions.

CAPTAIN DONELAN: Why should the Irish people be compelled to contribute towards the cost of a war which they abhor?

[No answer was given.]

TRANSPORT OFFICERS—REWARDS AND DISTINCTIONS.

MR. LAMBERT (Devon, South Molton): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether the work of the transport officers at the ports of embarkation will be recognised in conection with any rewards that may be distributed for services during the past year.

MR. GOSCHEN: I must deprecate Parliamentary questions with regard to rewards and distinctions. The responsibility rests decidedly with the Board of Admiralty, and the grace of conferring any distinction might easily be marred by any appearance of Parliamentary pressure.

BOER PRISONERS FOR CEYLON.

CAPTAIN SINCLAIR (Forfarshire): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether any number of Boer prisoners of war have been or are being sent to Ceylon; and, if so, how many, and to what place.

*MR. WYNDHAM: Yes, Sir. Lord Roberts telegraphed on the 12th inst. that a body of prisoners would leave for Ceylon in a few days, but their number was not stated. Preparations have been made for the reception of about 2,000 prisoners and their guards at Bandarawolla, in the hill country.

RECENT MILITARY OPERATIONS.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I beg to ask the Under Secretary for War whether there is anything to communicate to the House about South Africa. There is a rumour that there is some news from South Africa.

*MR. WYNDHAM: I think that all the news there is has been published this morning.

HOSPITAL RETURNS.

MR. MADDISON (Sheffield, Brightside): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if he will state the number of men now in hospital in South Africa from causes other than wounds.

*MR. WYNDHAM: It has already been explained to the House that it is not practicable to give the information required. The numbers vary from day to day and we receive no telegraphic information about them. I can, however, give the admissions at any place, at any date, if that will satisfy the hon. Member.

BOER WOMEN SENT TO THE ENEMY'S LINES.

MR. C. P. SCOTT (Lancashire, Leigh): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if he can now state whether a proclamation was issued at Pretoria on Wednesday last ordering the wives of all Boers believed to be in the field against us to report themselves to the authorities on the following day in order that they might be sent into the enemy's lines, and whether they and their children have been so sent; and whether among these women are included any who have been rendered destitute through the destruction for military purposes of their farms and crops.

*MR. WYNDHAM: No, Sir. No Report has reached the War Office.

3RD INNISKILLING FUSILIERS.

MR. MACALEESE (Monaghan, N.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if he can state how many men of the 3rd Battalion Royal Inniskilling Fusiliers, stationed at Cowshott Manor Camp, responded to the call made in February last to volunteer for service in South Africa; were any deprivations of privilege made in the case of men who then declined to volunteer; and how many men responded to a further call for volunteers made upon this corps in the present month, and have any of the corps been visited with displeasure for refusal.

*MR. WYNDHAM: As I stated in reply to this question on Thursday, the 3rd Inniskilling Fusiliers was not asked by the Secretary of State for War to volunteer for service abroad, either in February or later.

MILITARY LANDS ACT, 1892.

CAPTAIN SINCLAIR: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War, in regard to England and Scotland respectively, if he will state how many county and borough councils have exercised the powers given for the purchase of land under the Military Lands Act, 1892; what number of acres has been so purchased; what sum has been so expended; and what proportion of that sum has been borrowed under the powers conferred by the Act.

*MR. WYNDHAM: The War Office has cognisance only of cases where compulsion is required, and only one such case has occurred among purchases made by county or borough councils, viz., at Great Yarmouth. The Local Government Board has cognisance of all sums of money borrowed under the Act; two cases have occurred, a loan of £12,600 to the town council of Nottingham, for the purchase of 120 acres of land for rifle ranges; and a loan of £123 to the town council of Chesterfield, for the purchase of two roods of land for a drill hall. But when the council is able to buy the land by agreement, and without borrowing, the transaction is not reported to any Government department.

WAR OFFICE EMPLOYEES' BONUS.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office if he can state whether, seeing that the privileges of certain War Office employees computed at 1s. a week, were taken into consideration when their minimum wage was raised to 22s. a week, these men are not entitled to a certain bonus; and whether he will see that a storehouseman named Wales (Army Clothing Department), who, after serving for seventeen years, was discharged in consequence of an accident, receives the bonus for that number of years service, irrespective of the compensation he received for injuries.

*THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Mr. J. POWELL-WILLIAMS, Birmingham, S.): The Superannuation Act directs that gratuities on discharge shall be calculated on wages, and there is no power to vary the basis of assessment. Wales obtained under the Workmen's Compensation Act a weekly allowance which cannot be supplemented by a gratuity. The hon. Member does not accurately state the amount of the minimum wage.

CAPTAIN NORTON: Did not the man in question receive compensation in consequence of injuries sustained? Is he not therefore entitled to a bonus?

*MR. J. POWELL-WILLIAMS: No, Sir. The workman in question received what he got under the provisions of the Workmen's Compensation Act, and he was not entitled to anything beyond that.

CAPTAIN NORTON: Is he not entitled to a bonus?

*MR. J. POWELL-WILLIAMS: I do not know what the hon. and gallant Member means by a bonus. If he will speak to me privately I may clear up any misunderstanding.

LANCASHIRE VOLUNTEER ALLOWANCES.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office when his decision will be announced as to the supplementary grant to be paid to certain Lancashire Volunteer regiments in respect of their travelling expenses, which have been 5s. per head above the usual grant; and whether any special allowance is to be made for the carriage of cycles to and from camp.

*MR. WYNDHAM: The question of the travelling expenses referred to has been decided in favour of the corps, and the necessary instructions have been sent. There is no special grant for the conveyance of cycles; the allowance of £2 is intended to cover all extra incidental charges.

KILWORTH RIFLE RANGE.

MR. MAURICE HEALY (Cork): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether proceedings are at present pending or contemplated on the part of the War Office to acquire for the purpose of adding it to the Kilworth Rifle Range a large tract of land in the immediate locality; and will he state under what Act these proceedings are being taken, what stage they have reached, what area of land it is proposed to ac-

quire, and how many families it is proposed to evict.

*MR. J. POWELL-WILLIAMS: No, Sir; there is no such intention.

MR. MAURICE HEALY: Then what was the meaning of the communication addressed to the Cork County Council, stating there was such an intention?

*MR. J. POWELL-WILLIAMS: That, no doubt, had reference to the schedule of a Bill introduced into another place, and since withdrawn.

ARMY SHIRT CONTRACTS.

MR. MAURICE HEALY: I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office if he will state the total quantity of Army shirts tendered for and supplied respectively by shirt manufacturers in the United Kingdom for the troops in South Africa during the past twelve months; what proportion was tendered for by manufacturers in the south of Ireland, and were their tenders accepted; what were the conditions of specification as to quality stipulated for by the Government, and were those conditions complied with by south of Ireland manufacturers; and, seeing that the identical quality of shirting previously accepted by the Government was offered at a lower price by one of the largest manufacturers of those goods in the south of Ireland, and that the tender was declined, can he explain why Irish manufacturers have received none of the Government contracts for Army shirts.

*MR. J. POWELL-WILLIAMS: The total quantity being supplied is about 700,000; 31,000 were offered by south of Ireland firms and were not accepted. The material was to be flannel or union mixture containing not less than 50 per cent. of wool. In some cases the supply was to be to War Office pattern; in others the contractors were allowed to submit their own patterns. If there had been great emergency at the time the orders referred to were placed, some samples submitted by south of Ireland firms might have been accepted, but there was then no difficulty in meeting the requirements from the more suitable samples submitted by other firms. Nothing is known as to the particular case referred to in the second paragraph, but nine Irish manufacturers received orders, and a considerable number of other shirts were manufactured in Ireland by firms whose head offices are in Great Britain.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): Out of the many millions spent on these matters, has threepence gone to Ireland?

THE CHANNEL FLEET—VISIT TO INVERGORDON.

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid): On behalf of the hon. Member for Ross and Cromarty, I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether arrangements will be made for the Channel Fleet to visit Invergordon this summer.

MR. GOSCHEN: Beyond a visit to Berehaven for the purpose of carrying out certain exercises, the movements of the Channel squadron subsequent to the manœuvres have not yet been decided upon.

SAILING TRAINING SQUADRON.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty can he say what officer, or officers, and what men have been in charge of H.M.S. "Raleigh" and of the other three ships of the sailing training squadron since this squadron was put out of commission and laid up on 31st October, 1899; have any officers and men lived on board the ships since that date, and, if so, how many on board each ship; are these ships now in sufficiently good condition to enable them to be fitted out again for sea; what other ships besides these four would be available for use as a sailing training squadron; and is it proposed to build any more ships that would be so available; and, if so, when is it expected that these latter will be ready for use.

MR. GOSCHEN: It is not possible to give all the information asked for by the hon. Gentleman within the limits of an answer to a Parliamentary question. Generally speaking, the ships forming the recent training squadron have been in the hands of care and maintenance parties at the ports since they were put out of commission last year. Of these a limited number live on board when necessary. The "Cleopatra" is about to replace the "Curaçoa" as a sea-going training ship for boys. The "Raleigh" is fit for service at sea. The "Volage"

would need a thorough refit before being commissioned for sea service, and the "Champion" a refit of less extent. The following ships are available for service, but they would require extensive repairs, and re-boilering at once or after a short period:—"Calypso," "Active," "Cordelia," and "Curaçoa." With reference to the last question of the hon. Member, the hon. Gentleman knows the shipbuilding programme for this year, and I am not prepared to anticipate next year's programme.

FOREIGN MEN-OF-WAR IN JERSEY HARBOURS.

MR. LAMBERT: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether foreign war vessels are constantly manœuvring in and out of the harbours of Jersey; and whether there are any regulations limiting such vessels from practising these evolutions.

MR. GOSCHEN: No recent reports of the proceedings of foreign war vessels, as suggested in the question, have been received by the Admiralty. There are no special regulations as to the limitation of vessels practising evolutions, but attention would be called to any infraction of international usage, should such occur.

MR. LAMBERT: What are the rules of "international usage"?

MR. GOSCHEN: I have said there are no regulations.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER (Belfast, W.): Is it not notorious that French men-of-war have been manœuvring in these waters? Is it in accordance with ordinary usage?

MR. GOSCHEN: My attention has not been called to the fact.

ROYAL MARINE OFFICERS' CLOTHING.

MR ARNOLD-FORSTER: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether officers of the Royal Marines serving on board ship in warm climates are compelled by regulation to wear white clothing, and are also compelled by regulation to wear khaki clothing when engaged in active operations ashore; and, if so, whether he will sanction the adoption of one type of hot weather uniform, so as to relieve officers of the Royal Marines of the heavy expense entailed by the present arrangement.

MR. GOSCHEN: I am informed that officers of the Royal Marines are not compelled by regulation to wear khaki clothing under any circumstances, but that description of uniform has been worn as a matter of convenience and discretion in some recent active operations on shore. I will inquire further into the matter.

INDIAN FAMINE—RELIEF STATISTICS.

MR. C. P. SCOTT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he can state the total number of persons on relief in the famine districts, and the number who are still being relieved in famine camps; and whether he will obtain the statistics of deaths from cholera, which are available in India, for the information of the House before the debate takes place on the Indian Budget.

*LORD G. HAMILTON: The famine telegram, dated the 14th July, and published in the daily press, stated that 6,148,000 were in receipt of relief, it added that, "Village relief and advances were replacing relief works." I cannot at present specify how many out of this total were relieved at their villages and how many were on relief works. I can obtain the total figures for cholera deaths in British districts and in Native States, so far as they are available in India, but they may not be sent in time for the debate on Thursday next.

ADVANCES TO CULTIVATORS FOR SEED AND CATTLE.

MR. C. P. SCOTT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether in many of the famine districts from 75 to 90 per cent. of the cattle have died; what proportion of the cultivators in the district affected will need advances for seed and cattle; and what proportion of these can be assisted out of the 123 lacs allotted for the purpose, and the charitable funds; and whether he has information to show that there are enough cattle available in India to supply immediate needs; and if not, whether any steps are being taken to make good the deficiency from elsewhere.

*LORD G. HAMILTON: I have no trustworthy information about the mor-

tality among cattle; nor can I give particulars as to the proportion of cultivators that will be relieved from advances made by Government and from the charitable fund respectively. If the funds already allotted for this purpose prove insufficient more money will be granted. No cattle have been brought into India from outside to meet the present need; but cattle are being moved into the famine districts from more prosperous parts of India.

LOANS TO NATIVE STATES.

MR. C. P. SCOTT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India what steps, if any, are being taken to assist the Governments of the Native States to obtain the necessary funds for making advances to cultivators for the purchase of plough cattle and seed grains.

*LORD G. HAMILTON: The loans to Native States for famine purposes and the grants to those States from the Charitable Fund are intended to cover the necessary advances and gifts to cultivators in those tracts. In my answer to the hon. Member for Banffshire on Thursday, I stated the amount of those loans.† Up to the end of May 26½ lacs (£177,000) had also been allotted by the Central Committee of the Charitable Fund for expenditure in Native States.

INDIAN RAILWAYS—FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENT.

MR. GORDON (Elgin and Nairn): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether, in calculating the rate of interest under the contract powers for paying off (by annuities) the shareholders of the East Indian Railway Company in 1880, the Eastern Bengal Railway Company in 1884, and the Scinde Railway Company in 1886, the agreed results (namely, £4 6s., £3 17s., and £3 16s. 6d.) were the outcome of the same methods of interpretation as explained before a Committee of the House of Commons in 1879 by Sir Louis Mallet, Mr. Danvers, and Viscount Cranbrook.

*LORD G. HAMILTON: The East Indian Railway was bought under a special arrangement outside the contract which the Select Committee of 1879 (of which I was chairman) agreed to, on the understanding that the rate fixed was not to form a precedent. In determining the terms of subsequent purchases under the Acts of Parliament the other two railways were bought under the contract, and the rate of interest was determined by the governor and the deputy-governor of the Bank as prescribed by contract. I have no knowledge of the view they took of the evidence given before the Select Committee of 1879.

MR. GORDON: May I ask whether the same method was followed on the three occasions?

*LORD G. HAMILTON: I should imagine not, because the Committee of which I was chairman distinctly laid it down that sanction was only given to the exceptional purchase in 1879 on the understanding that it was not to form a precedent.

MR. GORDON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether the rates of interest agreed to by the Indian Government on the termination of the contracts of the East Indian, Eastern Bengal, and Scinde Railway Companies during the past twenty years—namely, £4 6s., £3 17s., and £3 16s. 6d. per cent.—represented the average rate of interest received by persons who invested in the three India sterling stocks during the two-year period relating to each of those three contracts.

*LORD G. HAMILTON: As I have before said, the purchase of the East Indian Railway stands on quite a different footing from those of the Eastern Bengal and Scinde Railway Companies, and was not based on the average rate of interest received by investors. I have no knowledge of how the Governor and Deputy Governor of the Bank of England calculated the rate of interest for the annuities of the other two purchases.

MR. GORDON: Will the noble Lord make inquiry?

*LORD G. HAMILTON: According to the contract, the Governor and Deputy Governor are given the power of deciding what the rate is. I think it would be most improper for the Secretary of State to interfere with their discretion in any way.

† See page 465 of this volume.

STATE-AIDED RAILWAYS — DETERMINATION OF CONTRACTS.

MR. GORDON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether it is the intention of the Indian Government to pay due respect to the precedents established during the past twenty years in their policy regarding the determination of any future railway contracts; and, if not, whether he will give due notice of this intention, and an explanation of his policy in the matter.

*LORD G. HAMILTON: It is the intention of the Secretary of State in Council to act on all occasions of this kind in strict conformity with the terms prescribed in the contracts with the various Indian railway companies.

NIGER COAST PROTECTORATE—SPIRIT IMPORTS.

MR. LAWRENCE (Liverpool, Abercromby): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can say what was the amount of spirits imported into the Niger Coast Protectorate during the months of March, April, May, and June in the years 1898 and 1899 respectively; and whether any, and, if any, what number of native traders in Opobo and Old Calabar have paid duties on their stocks in store, under the proclamation of 17th May, and the amount of such duty.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): I regret that I am unable to say what was the amount of spirits imported into the Niger Coast Protectorate in the months specified, as the Returns received give only the total imports for each year, and no information has been received as to the duties paid on stocks by native traders in Opobo and Old Calabar.

IMPERIAL TELEGRAPHIC COMMUNICATION—DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON (Hythe): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he would state to the House the composition of the Departmental Committee on the system of Cable Telegraphs of the Empire, the scope, and the terms of its reference.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. HANBURY, Preston): The terms of reference are "To inquire into the present system of telegraphic communication between different parts of the Empire, and to consider in what respects it requires to be supplemented. To investigate the relations between private cable companies and the Imperial and Colonial Governments (including the Government of India), the amount of control at present exercised by these Governments, and the policy which should be pursued by them in future, especially when new concessions are sought. To examine existing rates, to report how far they are fair and reasonable; and, if not, how any reduction should be effected." The Committee will consist of Lord Balfour of Burleigh, the Postmaster General, the Secretary to the Treasury, the Under Secretaries for India and the Colonies, and two members from the Intelligence branches of the Admiralty and the War Office.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON: Will the Committee have power to send for persons and Papers?

MR. HANBURY: Certainly.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON: Will the evidence and Report be printed?

MR. HANBURY: That I cannot say.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Will the hon. Gentleman undertake to supplement the Committee by two gentlemen of common sense?

SCHOOL ATTENDANCE AUTHORITIES—BYE-LAWS IN AGRICULTURAL DISTRICTS.

MR. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, Basingstoke): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education if he can state how many school attendance authorities have made bye-laws under the Elementary Education Act of 1899, providing for the exemption of school attendance during certain months of the year of children between the ages of eleven and thirteen who are employed in agriculture.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL ON EDUCATION (Sir J. GORST, Cambridge University): There are thirty-six such bye-laws now ready for sanction.

CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION.

MR. MATHER (Lancashire, Rossendale): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether he is aware that the Association of Technical Institutions has addressed a letter to the President of the Board, asking him to receive a deputation of that body to submit to him their views on the composition of the Consultative Committee appointed by him, and named in the Draft Order in Council now lying upon the Table of this House, and to call his attention to the fact that the Committee as constituted is wholly academic and includes no representative of the scientific, technical, and commercial industries of the country, in which the practical results of our system of national education have to be tested; whether this omission is intended to imply that the Board of Education will not seek from the Consultative Committee any assistance in determining and improving, from time to time, the character and quality of the whole system of our national education; whether it is the intention of the Board of Education to exclude all questions from the matters referred to the Committee by the Board; and whether, if this be the case, the Vice-President of the Board will explain to the House what are the functions and responsibilities (if any) which the Consultative Committee will be required to perform.

SIR J. GORST: The answer to the first paragraph of the question is in the affirmative, and to the second and third paragraphs in the negative. The functions of the Consultative Committee are defined in the fourth Section of the Board of Education Act, 1899; they are:—(a) to frame regulations for a register of teachers and (b) to advise the Board of Education on any matter referred to the Committee by the Board.

MR. MATHER: Will Section 4 cover such questions as the improvement of our system of national education?

SIR J. GORST: Yes, if referred to the Committee by the Board.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY MAPS.

MR. HAZELL (Leicester): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether his attention has been called to the limited sales of maps prepared by the Geological Survey; can he explain how it is that while the annual cost of the Survey is upwards of £17,000, the receipts from the sale of the maps is less than £1,000; whether he has observed that the maps, being published on the one-inch scale, are too small for many purposes, and that the six-inch maps can only be obtained on special application, and coloured by hand at a high price, and that their existence is but little known; whether similar maps of other countries are printed in colours, and published at a much lower price; and will he look into the question with a view to making them more widely useful.

SIR J. GORST: A Departmental Committee has been appointed by the Lord President of the Council to inquire into various matters regarding the Geological Survey, and no definite answer can be given to the questions asked until the Committee has reported.

LONDON SCHOOL BOARD AUDIT CASE.

MR. EVELYN CECIL (Hertfordshire, Hertford): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether he is aware of the cause of the delay in submitting to the Queen's Bench the London School Board audit case, with reference to the alleged illegal expenditure by the Board of ratepayers' money on secondary education; and will he take steps to secure that the case should in the public interest be submitted immediately.

SIR J. GORST: I am not aware of any cause which prevents the London School Board audit case being now submitted to the Queen's Bench Division. The Board of Education is not a party to the record, and has no right to interfere in the case. I do not know what step it is possible for the Board of Education to take to expedite the proceedings, but an immediate decision of the question is of the most urgent importance in the interests of education, both to the school boards and the Government Department.

RECENT POSTAL DELAYS.

SIR GEORGE FARDELL (Paddington, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster

General, whether he can have steps taken to remedy the inconvenience experienced by residents in Sheringham, Norfolk, caused by the alteration in the postal arrangements, the effect of which is that letters coming by the night mail from London and elsewhere are not delivered until the second post instead of in the early morning as heretofore.

MR. HANBURY: The effect of the recent alterations in the postal arrangements at Sheringham will be to accelerate the first delivery of letters at that place, and letters posted in time for the night mail from London should be included in that delivery. The Postmaster General regrets that, owing to mistakes in sorting and to the recent temporary disarrangement of the postal service in London, some letters for Sheringham which should have been included in the first delivery have not been delivered until the second. Proper notice has been taken of the errors in sorting, and the Postmaster General hopes that the Service will be more regularly performed in future.

MR. BARTLEY (Islington, N.): Can the right hon. Gentleman give us any date when the confusion at the Post Office will be ended?

MR. HANBURY: I can only give the assurance which the Post Office have repeatedly given me, to the effect that the confusion is over already.

SIR GEORGE FARDELL also asked a supplementary question, which was inaudible.

MR. HANBURY'S reply was that he had no information, but would find out.

EXCESS POSTAGE.

MR. DUCKWORTH (Lancashire, Middleton): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if he is aware that quantities of letters are delivered without the ordinary penny stamp being affixed, on which twopence is charged on delivery, and that one London postman on a certain day collected 5s. in this way on his round; and can he say if the percentage of letters so charged has greatly increased since the change was made from the old red stamp, and, if so, does it arise from insufficient gumming or inferior quality of adhesive material used, and can he state the number of unstamped letters posted in a year, and of stamps found in receptacles in which letters are posted, how much the postal authorities gain yearly by stamps thus found, how much from letters unstamped, and whether he will consider the advisability of a reduction of the twopenny fee charged on unstamped letters.

MR. HANBURY: The Postmaster General is not aware how many letters are charged 2d. on delivery because they do not bear a penny stamp. No records of such letters are kept, and it cannot be stated, therefore, whether the number of charges has increased or diminished since the old red stamp was discontinued. The value of stamps found loose in post offices and left on post office counters by the public amounts in one year to about £300. The quality of the gum used is satisfactory, and the Postmaster General believes that postage stamps, which are now made of thinner paper, adhere more firmly than formerly to the covers to which they are affixed. It is not considered desirable to reduce the twopenny fee charged on unstamped letters. The expense of collecting charges for deficient postage is considerable.

INCOME TAX DEDUCTIONS.

MR. HAZELL: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, in reference to deductions for income tax, whether in the past, when the income tax has been lowered, it has been the custom to deduct the tax at the lower rate in respect of income accruing after 5th April upon the class of securities which are now under similar circumstances charged at 1s.

MR. HANBURY: The answer is in the affirmative.

SEIZURES OF FOREIGN PRISON-MADE GOODS.

MR. LAMBERT: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury in how many instances the Prison-made Goods Act has been put in force, and what has been the value and the nature of the goods that have come under its operation.

MR. HANBURY: There have been six consignments only since the passing of the Act 60 and 61 Vic., chap. 63, in which the Commissioners of Customs were satisfied that goods imported into the

United Kingdom were in whole or in part of prison origin. The goods were in each case mats which the Commissioners were satisfied had been, at least, partially manufactured in Belgium by convict labour. The six consignments consisted of 126 bundles of the declared value of £183. The whole of the mats were seized and subsequently destroyed by fire.

DISTRICT MESSENGERS COMPANY.

COLONEL MILWARD (Stratford-upon-Avon): May I ask whether it is true that the licence of the District Messengers Company is not to be renewed.

MR. HANBURY: I know nothing officially on the subject. About three years ago, on behalf of the Treasury, I reduced the royalty in connection with this company for the purpose of encouraging it.

WATER FOR CATTLE ON RAILWAYS.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): On behalf of the hon. Member for the St. Patrick Division of Dublin, I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether during the continuance of this exceptionally hot weather special arrangements could be made by the railway companies in the three kingdoms to enable live stock to obtain water upon journeys of any distance or delays exceeding six hours.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (MR. RITCHIE, Croydon): My right hon. friend the President of the Board of Agriculture informs me that the Water Supply on Railways Order of 1895 requires that water shall be provided at about 1,100 railway stations in Great Britain for the use of animals carried by rail. He has received no complaint as to the inadequacy of these arrangements, which he believes to be fully sufficient to meet the object which the hon. Member has in view.

THIRD-CLASS SEASON TICKETS.

MR. STEPHENS (Middlesex, Hornsey): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the fact that many of the railway companies running into London, though issuing season tickets to first and second class passengers, refuse to issue season tickets to third-class passengers, and that, in consequence, third-class are compelled to pay in most cases more than first-class, and in all cases more than second-class passengers. Can he explain why first, second, and third class passengers are not treated alike with regard to season tickets, and required to pay an equal proportionate charge for them; and whether he will consider the position of the railway companies towards the poorer classes of suburban travellers, and take steps to secure for them conditions for season tickets similar to those accorded to first and second class passengers.

MR. RITCHIE: The issue of season tickets by railway companies is a voluntary act on their part. They are not under legal obligation to do anything of the kind, and it follows that the Board of Trade are not in a position to intervene. If, however, the hon. Member is prepared and desires to give me a specific case, or cases, of hardship, the Board will be happy to use their good offices to obtain a fair consideration of the matter.

CONVICT WARDERS AND THE RESERVE — PORTLAND ESTABLISHMENT.

MR. J. A. PEASE (Northumberland, Tyneside): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department how many Reservists have been taken from the prison warders and civil guards in Her Majesty's convict prisons, and to what extent have their places been filled up; will he explain why at the present time only six warders are now employed at the West Quarries of the Portland convict establishment to supervise 170 convicts, whereas the recognised proportion is one warder for every ten convicts; and whether the absence of a larger staff has tended to produce insubordination; and how many cases at Portland of flogging for prison offences have there been during the last six months.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Sir M. WHITE RIDLEY, Lancashire, Blackpool): Fifty-three Reservists have been taken from the prison warders and convict guards in convict prisons. Their places have been filled with one exception. The number of convicts employed in the West Quarries is on the average 204, and the number of officers employed to supervise them is seventeen. This is one to twelve. The proportion of one warder to every

ten convicts includes officers sick, on leave, and on escort, and is a fixed proportion of staff to cover all contingencies. The percentage of staff at Portland and other convict prisons has, in fact, been increased, and is over 10 per cent. There is no foundation for the suggestion that the absence of a larger staff has tended to produce insubordination. The number of cases of corporal punishment at Portland during the last six months was five.

CONVICT WARDERS' PENSIONS.

MR. J. A. PEASE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether the warders at the four convict prisons petitioned last year for an increase in their pensions, and what reply, if any, has been sent to them.

*SIR M. WHITE RIDLEY: I may refer the hon. Member to an answer which I gave to the hon. Member for the Richmond Division of Yorkshire on 12th March last, to the effect that such petitions have been received, but that the question of pensions is primarily one for the Treasury, and that I am not at present prepared to propose the legislation which would be necessary in order to carry the prayer of petition into effect.

SHEFFIELD LAUNDRY PROSECUTION.

MR. TENNANT (Berwickshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether the Victoria Laundries, Limited, of Howard Street, Sheffield, who have been recently prosecuted and fined for breaches of the Factory Acts, are, as they assert, contractors to Her Majesty's Government; and, if so, to what Department.

*SIR M. WHITE RIDLEY: I have ascertained that the firm in question have a contract with the War Office to wash for Sheffield Barracks.

BAIL REGULATIONS.

MR. HAZELL (Leicester): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General whether his attention has been called to the statements of Mr. Justice Wright in charging the grand jury at the Derbyshire Assizes on the 11th instant, in reference to the detention of persons awaiting trial; whether he is aware that it appeared from the calendar before the Court that accused persons had been detained for periods amounting in the aggregate to three years; that this was mainly due to justice's clerks being ignorant of recent legislation which removed difficulties once existing with regard to bail; and that, in particular, a man was brought before Mr. Justice Wright charged with perjury, who had been ten weeks in prison awaiting trial, and the jury found him innocent; while in two other charges where persons were convicted of manslaughter they were discharged because they had been three months in prison awaiting trial; and what action does the Government propose to take to prevent similar occurrences in future.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs): My attention has been called to the remarks of Mr. Justice Wright at the Derbyshire Assizes. I understand that in discharging the grand jury the learned Judge modified these remarks in respect of two or three prisoners who had been offered bail before the magistrates and had refused it. There appears to be no doubt that there had been a good deal of detention before trial which might have been prevented by the exercise of the power of the magistrates to grant bail, but I have not been able to verify all the details stated in the second paragraph of the question. The Bail Act of 1898 was passed with the object of preventing unnecessary detention, and the Government have under consideration the propriety of taking steps to call the attention of justices' clerks to the provisions of this Act.

ROAD CONSTRUCTION IN THE ISLAND OF LEWIS.

MR. CALDWELL: On behalf of the hon. Member for Ross and Cromarty, I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether the construction of the road between Cromore and Graver, in the Park District of the Island of Lewis, is now being proceeded with; and, if not, will he state the cause of the delay.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): I am informed by the Congested Districts Board that they are still awaiting the information from the district committee referred to in the answer given to the hon. Member on 1st May last.

INVER WATER SUPPLY.

MR. CALDWELL: On behalf of the hon. Member for Ross and Cromarty I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether the Secretary for Scotland is aware that the medical officer of health for Ross and Cromarty reports that the water supply of the village of Inver, in the parish of Tain, about which complaints were made last year, is still unsatisfactory; and will he state what steps have been taken by the Local Government Board in the matter.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: I am informed by the Local Government Board that they have been in constant communication during last year with East Ross District Committee and on 26th April last received from the local medical officer an assurance that the local authority had agreed to protect the wells, cover them up, and put pumps in them, and that the works were to be proceeded with immediately. As an excuse for delay in completing these measures the local authority now plead the ignorance and prejudice of the people, who are said to be quite satisfied with the present state of matters, and have accordingly broken a pump which had been put up by a private benefactor. I am to add that the Local Government Board will lose no opportunity of pressing the local authority to do their duty in the matter.

CRIME IN COUNTY MONAGHAN.

MR. DALY (Monaghan, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, at the recent assizes in the county Monaghan, the judge said that he interviewed the county inspector of police, who reported the county to be in a most satisfactory state and almost free from crime; and whether, under these circumstances, he will advise the removal of the operation of the Peace Preservation Act from the county of Monaghan.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. G. W. BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): The reply to the first paragraph is in the affirmative. The Government do not consider it desirable to revoke the proclamation of the county Monaghan under the provisions of the Peace Preservation Act.

IRISH POLICE BATONS AND HANDCUFFS.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state where the batons and handcuffs used by the police in Ireland are made, and what is the capital cost of those now employed by the Royal Irish Constabulary and Dublin Metropolitan Police.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: The batons and handcuffs used by the Irish police were obtained many years ago from a firm in Dublin; it is not known where they were made. The estimated cost of these articles was about £1,900.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Were they made in Germany?

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: They were obtained in Dublin, many years ago.

COUNTY COURTS (IRELAND) BILL.

MR. MAURICE HEALY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will arrange, with a view to the passing next year of the County Courts (Ireland) Bill, to prepare and circulate a draft of the rules, orders, and forms proposed to be made under it, including the scale of court fees proposed to be charged to litigants.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: I cannot, without consulting the Lord Chancellor for Ireland, undertake to act on the suggestion of the hon. Member, but the matter will be considered.

MR. MAURICE HEALY: I will repeat the question.

IRISH LOCAL GOVERNMENT RETURNS.

MR. MAURICE HEALY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will grant a Return showing the population, local government electorate, and poor law valuation of each county, county district (rural and urban), and electoral division or ward in each such district in Ireland, and of the number of county and district councillors for each such county, county district, electoral division, or ward.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: There is no objection, in principle, to a Return such as indicated, but it would take consider-

able time and labour to prepare, and could not in any case be ready before October. Under all the circumstances I think it would be better to postpone the preparation of the Return until after the approaching census, as the population and valuation of the altered areas can then be stated with a degree of accuracy which could not be shown if the Return were prepared now.

MR. MAURICE HEALY: Would not that involve postponement for another year?

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: If the hon. Gentleman will communicate with the Local Government Board, I think it would serve his purpose much better.

IRISH TEACHERS AND RESULTS FEES.

MR. M'DERMOTT (Kilkenny, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he will explain why the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland will not pay the equivalent for results fees now due to teachers in whose schools the results period terminated on 30th June, such as the presentation convent school in Kilkenny and the Castlecomer Convent School, sooner than the middle of next October, whereas the teachers of schools in which the results period terminated on 31st May are to be paid these equivalents in the middle of this month. And can he state when will the old arrears of the Education Grant, due to Irish National school teachers for 1892 and subsequent years, be paid to them.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: Schools examined for results in former years in the June quarter will be paid the equivalent grant, as far as possible, with the June quarterly payments, and schools, including the two specially referred to in the question, whose results examinations took place in the September quarter will be paid the grant with the salary payments for that quarter. A Supplementary Estimate for the payments mentioned in the second paragraph has already been introduced, but the payments cannot be made until the Vote has been passed.

PUBLIC HOUSE LICENCES IN IRELAND.

MR. MAURICE HEALY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will arrange for an annual Return of the number of new public-house licences granted and extinguished in each quarter sessions division in Ireland, showing in each case whether the new licence was granted in substitution for an existing licence.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: I am making inquiry into this matter, and will ask the hon Member to repeat the question on Thursday next.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—HOUSE RENT ALLOWANCES.

MR. MAURICE HEALY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the allowance made for house rent to all married members of the Royal Irish Constabulary below the rank of district inspector is only 1s. per week; and can he state what allowance is made for the same purpose to district and county inspectors, and at what date the amount in question was first fixed, and on what principle it was arrived at.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: The fact is as stated in the first paragraph; but married members of the force below the rank of district inspector are also exempt from a statutory deduction of 1s. per week from their pay, which exemption practically raises the lodging allowance to £5 4s. per annum. A lodging allowance at the rate of £21 5s. 10d. per annum was fixed in 1870 in the case of a district inspector of the third class. The allowances payable to district inspectors of the second and first class vary, according to the length of service, from £27 10s. to £40, and a county inspector receives an allowance of £50. These allowances were fixed in 1882. The allowances to officers and men were fixed on a consideration of the class of house or lodging accommodation which, having regard to their rank in the force, they would be expected to occupy.

KILTEEVAN DRUM AND FIFE BAND.

MR. HAYDEN (Roscommon, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that on Sunday, 6th May, when the Kilteevan (county Roscommon) fife and drum band was returning from Roscommon to Kilteevan the members were accosted by District Inspector Rogers in

insulting language, and that he further stated that if he had sufficient force he would disperse them, while, upon that and the following Sunday, Sergeant Higgins interfered to prevent the leader of the band addressing his comrades; and can he state by what authority these officials acted in such a manner.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: I am informed there is no foundation for the statements in the question so far as the district inspector is concerned. It is true that the sergeant prevented one of the leaders of the band from addressing a meeting. The band, accompanied by a large crowd, had been demonstrating at certain grazing farms in the locality with the evident object of intimidating the persons who hold these farms. The sergeant had warned the ringleaders that their conduct was illegal.

SUTTON TO HOWTH TRAMWAY.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether the Great Northern (Ireland) Company dispute that the construction of their tramway from Sutton to Howth is illegal; and, if it is not in accordance with the Act, will he state whether the Board of Trade have ever previously sanctioned a line made contrary to statutory provisions; and, if so, where.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (MR. RITCHIE, Croydon): I understand that the answer to the first paragraph is in the affirmative. As to the second paragraph the Board have no powers either to sanction or not to sanction the line. They cannot determine the legal questions at issue, they are merely prepared to certify the line as fit for traffic on the understanding that the company will at an early date apply for such further Parliamentary powers as may be found to be necessary.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Will the right hon. Gentleman's inspector ascertain by reference to the Act the condition of the line, and whether the line is now in a legal state?

MR. RITCHIE: It is no part of our duty, nor have we inspectors qualified to determine the law on matters of that kind. All that the Board of Trade have to do is to certify that the line is fit to be opened for public traffic. We have to look after matters of safety and nothing more.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Is it not part of the function of the Board of Trade, where the Act of Parliament states that the line shall be laid on a level with the road, and when it is laid one foot and a half above that level, to state whether the line is legal or illegal?

MR. RITCHIE: No; our functions are confined to questions of safety.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Then I will ask the Attorney General whether he will consider whether an indictment should not be presented in regard to this line.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! If the hon. Member wishes to put a question of that kind he must give notice.

SLIGO AND NORTHERN COUNTIES RAILWAY—MIXED TRAINS.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that all trains run on the Sligo and Northern Counties Railway are not made up of passenger carriages, but mainly of heavily laden goods wagons; that on some parts of the line the engines are unable to do the haulage except at a slow pace; and that, at all the stations except two, passengers are detained at the risk of accidents and to their inconvenience while the shunting is being carried on, and about which the travelling public complain; and seeing that, owing to this practice, it takes about three hours at the present rate of sixteen miles an hour to run from Sligo to Enniskillen and *vice versa*, whether steps will be taken to improve the present system of working this line.

MR. RITCHIE: No, Sir; but I shall be happy to communicate with the railway company and direct their attention to the allegation made in the hon. Member's question.

TRUCK ACT PROSECUTION AT DUNGLOE SESSIONS.

MR. T. D. SULLIVAN (Donegal, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Mr. Patrick O'Donnell, of Doochary, county Donegal, was recently fined £5 and £2 costs at Dungloe Petty Sessions for a breach of the Truck Act; and that the Queen's Bench has since

ruled on appeal, in another case heard from the same petty sessions, that the Truck Act does not apply to such persons as those supplied with goods by the defendant; and whether the Government will order the amount of fine and costs to be remitted to Mr. O'Donnell.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): My right hon. friend has asked me to reply to this question. The reply to the first paragraph is in the affirmative. The proper course to adopt in all such cases is for the person concerned to petition the Lord Lieutenant praying for a remission of the fine and a return of the costs. Any such petition, if forwarded by Mr. O'Donnell, will be considered.

UNSUCCESSFUL APPLICATION AGAINST THE DONEGAL JUSTICES.

MR. T. D. SULLIVAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether any and what reply has been given to the application on behalf of Major Johnson and the other Donegal Justices to be allowed their expenses in reference to the recent unsuccessful application to attach them; whether he is aware that Chief Baron Palles, in refusing to make the conditional order absolute, stated he regretted he had no power to award costs to the justices, and that he was shocked at the action of Mr. Mackey, the Crown solicitor, who, in order to obtain a conditional order for attachment against the justices, suppressed the fact that the mandamus had been complied with, and pretended that no case had been stated; is he aware that the justices handed him the case at petty sessions, which he declined to take; and they then sent him the case by registered letter, which he refused to lodge; that he detatched a portion of the case thus sent him and affixed it to another document signed by a minority of the justices, and lodged the joint product as if it were a genuine case stated; that the judge of the Queen's Bench to whom the case was finally sent decided that the case originally refused by Mr. Mackey was a good case, and dismissed the attachment on the ground that the mandamus had been complied with; and that the court then heard the appeal on the case, and upheld the decision of the justices; and whether, under these circumstances, the Crown will see fit to recoup to the justices the expenses incurred by them in successfully defending themselves.

MR. ATKINSON: A reply has been given to the solicitor's letter to the effect that, as all the costs referred to were incurred by reason of the fact that the justices illegally and improperly refused to state a case for the opinion of the Queen's Bench Division when required so to do, the Crown must refuse to pay them the costs. I believe the Chief Baron did state that he regretted he had no power to award costs to the justices. It is impossible within the proper limits of an answer to a question, to give an epitome of the facts of the intricate litigation referred to. I have read over several times the authorised shorthand notes of the judgment of the court, and do not find that it contains any censure on Mr. Mackey or any other Crown official. No reference is made in this judgment to the other statements contained in the question, but as far as I have been able to ascertain, most of them are without foundation, and others misrepresent the actual facts. I have been informed, however, that the Lord Chief Baron, speaking in ignorance necessarily of the ultimate course contemplated by the Executive should they have been successful in the litigation then at hearing, found some fault with the mode in which the case had been conducted by the counsel. Notwithstanding the observations of the Lord Chief Baron, I am quite prepared, should the occasion offer, to justify in this House the action of the Crown in every particular. The reply to the last paragraph is in the negative.

CORK ASSIZES—SELECTION OF JURYMEN.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland whether his attention has been called to the proceedings at the Cork Assizes on the 18th instant, in connection with the trial of a man named Cadogan, charged with the murder of a land agent named Bird; whether he is aware that on the long jury panel being called over, over sixty jurors were ordered by the Crown to stand aside; was this system of jury selection adopted with the sanction of the Law Officers of the Crown; and, if so, what were the reasons; and can he state whether there is any precedent at a criminal assize for ordering such a number of citizens qualified to act as jurors to stand aside.

MR. ATKINSON: The answer to the first and second paragraphs is in the

affirmative. No directions other than those contained in the Circular of 12th February, 1894, addressed to Crown Solicitors, were given. The action of the Crown Solicitor in the present case was due to the fact that he was aware that efforts had been extensively and continuously made to influence the jurors in favour of the accused, and he reasonably believed that the men set aside would not, if sworn, have given an impartial verdict. It is impossible at such short notice to obtain particulars of the many instances in which as many or even a larger number of jurors were set aside. I may, however, mention the case of the Queen *v.* Morey, tried at the Cork Winter Assizes of 1893, when forty-one out of a panel of seventy-four jurors were ordered to stand aside.

CAPTAIN DONELAN: What reward will the Law Officers of the Crown receive for a service of this kind?

[No answer was given.]

DRIFT-NET FISHING AT ARKLOW.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture for Ireland if the Board have received from the fishermen of Arklow a petition praying for the removal of the restrictions upon drift-net fishing between sunrise and sunset; and, if so, whether the Board have come to any decision on the matter.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOR IRELAND (Mr. PLUNKETT, Dublin County, S.): The petition referred to has been received. No decision can be come to in the matter by the Department until an inquiry shall have been held by the Inspectors of Fisheries into the expediency of making a bye-law permitting the use of drift-nets between sunrise and sunset. This inquiry will be held as soon as possible.

PROTECTION OF IRISH FISHERIES.

MR. POWER (Waterford, E.): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture for Ireland whether the Admiralty have placed at the disposal of the new Department any gunboats to prevent steam trawlers fishing within the proscribed limits.

MR. PLUNKETT: As I have already stated, the cost of protecting the Irish fisheries from the depredations of trawlers must be defrayed out of the funds at the disposal of the Department for fishery purposes. The Admiralty have decided not to undertake this work.

MR. POWER: Have not three gunboats been placed at the disposal of the Board in Scotland for the protection of the country's fisheries?

LIGHTHOUSE AUTHORITY AT CAHIRCIVEEN.

CAPTAIN DONELAN: On behalf of the hon. Member for North Kerry, I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture for Ireland whether he can state who is the lighthouse or local authority in the Cahirciveen and Valentia districts, county Kerry, and whether, in the event of the Kerry County Council, who have already made a representation on this matter, being the local authority, the Congested Districts Board will accede to their request, which is supported by the local fishermen, by erecting a bell buoy and perch as already requested in the Cahirciveen and Valentia districts, so as to save the lives and property of men engaged in the fishery industry.

MR. PLUNKETT: I am informed there is no regularly constituted harbour authority at the places mentioned, but that the Irish Lights Board recognise the County Council of Kerry in the matter of local lights. The question whether the Congested Districts Board may make a contribution to the Kerry County Council in respect of the works referred to at Valentia and Cahirciveen will be considered by the board at their next meeting.

EQUALISATION OF DUBLIN RATES.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he proposes to take steps to give effect to the unanimous Report of the Joint Committee of Lords and Commons on the Dublin Corporation Bill, recommending the Government to bring in a Public Bill for the Equalisation of Rates in the Dublin districts analogous to that passed for London, and also enabling a joint rate for drainage and a Joint Drainage Board to be established for Dublin and the townships of Rathmines and Pembroke.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Any recommendation coming from so important a body deserves and will have the careful consideration of the Government, but, of

course, it would be premature for us to announce any policy on the subject at present.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON LOCAL TAXATION.

MR. LAMBERT: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can state when the Royal Commission on Local Taxation will present its Report.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am informed that the Commissioners are not in a position yet to state any date.

CONTEMPT OF COURT.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he is aware that, so far back as October, 1882, legislation for the curtailment of the power of arbitrary committal for contempt of court was promised in the House of Commons by the Prime Minister of the day; and whether, having regard to the remarks of the Chief Justice of England in April, 1896, and to the fact that one man has actually suffered imprisonment for 743 days for that offence, the Government will take steps for the introduction of legislation to define the power of Judges to commit for contempt of court, and to render that power subject to appeal.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am afraid I cannot return any very satisfactory answer to this question. I certainly could not give the opinion of the Government without a much fuller opportunity of consulting my colleagues, and, in any case, it would be impossible to attempt any legislation on the subject in the course of the present session.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Can the First Lord of the Treasury give any information as to the course of business? There is a Blue-book relating to the Cape, the consideration of which is absolutely essential to the discussion of the Colonial Vote. It only came into the hands of such Members as applied at the Vote Office this afternoon, although it was promised it should reach hon. Members this morning. I think the right hon. Gentleman will see that this is rather short time to consider it in preparation for to morrow's discussion. I appeal to the right hon. Gentleman, if he can with convenience to the House and the public, to postpone that Vote and take some other business on Tuesday.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am sorry that a misadventure has occurred about the Blue-book. These incidents make it very difficult for the Leader of the House to arrange the business to suit the convenience of the members. Under the circumstances, I will go forward with Bills on Tuesday and Wednesday. I cannot say when the Colonial Vote will be taken, but I will give the earliest notification to the House that is in my power. The Companies Bill will be taken on Tuesday.

MR. COURTNEY (Cornwall, Bodmin): May I urge the right hon. Gentleman to fix Monday for the Colonial Office Vote, or, at all events, to give it preference over any other Vote on the very earliest day?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: My anxiety is to bring on the Vote as soon as possible, and it is only in deference to appeal made to me in a very responsible quarter of the House that I feel myself reluctantly compelled to postpone the Vote. I must be allowed to consider what date I may fix for it, and I shall be glad to take it on Monday if it is convenient.

MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.): Could not the Colonial Vote be taken on Thursday or Friday?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think that would be inconvenient, as those days have long been allocated.

MR. CHANNING: Will Effective Supply be put down each night?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes, but no attempt will be made to commence it after midnight.

HIGHWAYS AND BRIDGES ACT (1891) AMENDMENT BILL.

Order for Committee read, and discharged; Bill withdrawn.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC LOCAL VETO (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Order for resuming adjourned debate on Amendment to Second Reading [2nd May] upon Wednesday, 25th July, read, and discharged; Bill withdrawn.

COUNTY COURTS (IRELAND) BILL
[Lords].

Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Thursday, and to be printed. [Bill 310.]

NEW MEMBER SWORN.

James Archibald Morrison, Esquire, for the County of Wiltshire (Southern or Wilton Division).

EXPIRING LAWS CONTINUANCE BILL.

On the introduction of this Bill,

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): Will the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Treasury explain what this Bill is? Judging from the precedent of former years, I expect it will be found to include an atrocious Act with reference to Ireland—an Act passed in 1881, and called the Peace Preservation Bill. Is it included?

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. HANBURY, Preston): Yes, it is.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Will the right hon. Gentleman give the House a list of the Bills included in it, instead of dealing with the House of Commons in the cavalier manner of simply raising his hat? I believe there are something like thirty-four Acts included. I should like to give the House some information as to this Act, which was only to last five years, and ever since 1886 has been renewed year by year. It has now come to be a formal proceeding——

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member must be aware that the practice has been not to discuss any particular Bill on the Second Reading, still less on the leave to introduce. The proper time to discuss a particular Act is in Committee, when the schedule is reached.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I will content myself with entering my protest against this method of keeping expiring Acts, and especially this atrocious Act, in force.

Bill to continue various expiring Laws, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Hanbury and Mr. Attorney General.

EXPIRING LAWS CONTINUANCE BILL.

"To continue various expiring Laws," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 311.]

MILITARY LANDS BILL.
[SECOND READING.]

Order for Second Reading read.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): It may be convenient that I should premise our consideration of the Second Reading of this Bill by a short explanation. The Bill comes down from another place, and since the House of Commons reserves to itself the exclusive right of initiating any proposals which may throw a charge even on local ratepayers, I need not deal with a great portion, at any rate, of the first three sections of the Bill until the Committee stage is reached. The object of the Bill is to amend the Military Lands Act of 1892. That Act, I should like the House to bear in mind, was a consolidating Act and nothing more. It was introduced as such by the late Mr. Stanhope, then Secretary of State for War, and welcomed as such by Mr. Shaw-Lefevre. Governments are too often pressed to introduce Acts to consolidate legislation of this kind, and when they do so they some times incur a certain risk, either for themselves or for their successors. The date of the Act is often mistaken for the date of the policy embodied in the Act, and when defects are revealed in the Act we are told that the policy is comparatively novel and experimental, and that any extension is to be deprecated pending longer experience. I cannot too strongly insist that the Act of 1892 was a consolidation Act which simply codified previous attempts to achieve certain objects by certain methods. The object of previous legislation was to facilitate the acquisition by Volunteer corps of sites for rifle ranges, and these Acts authorised co-operation between local bodies and Volunteer corps for the purpose of financing the transaction. They also authorised the Secretary of State to draw up bye-laws to ensure that shooting was carried on with safety. The Volunteer Act of 1863, for example, specifically laid down that corporations of various descriptions might transfer land to Volunteer corps for a period of twenty-one years, and authorised the Secretary of State to make bye-laws. It is true that that Act only dealt with the acquisition of sites for rifle ranges, and limited

the area to be acquired to four acres; but these limitations disappeared in subsequent enactments. The whole matter, as far as the principle is concerned, is in a nutshell. By the Regulation of the Forces Act, 1871, the power given by the Act of 1863 was extended to the acquisition of land for drill-sheds and any military purpose sanctioned by the Secretary of State, and the provisions of the Act of 1863 were extended to the Yeomanry and the Militia. I need not, however, trouble the House with the Militia, as that force dropped out of all this legislation under the Militia Act, 1882. The House is aware that larger powers have constantly accrued by a series of Acts to popularly elected local bodies as they advanced in importance, and as they advanced also towards their present democratic basis. The whole of this series of Acts giving additional powers to popularly elected local bodies as they advanced in importance was accompanied by another series of Acts authorising local bodies to use these new powers for the very same objects and by the very same methods which were sanctioned by the Act of 1863. That is to say, they might use their new powers in order to facilitate the acquisition of land for Volunteer rifle ranges, drill-sheds, and other purposes. All this legislation was consolidated in the Act of 1892. In the course of the eight years during which that Act has been in operation, one can hardly be surprised to find, as is usual in such cases, that certain defects have been revealed and certain extensions have been suggested, and unless we now remedy those defects and grant those extensions, we shall defeat the purpose and impair the usefulness of the Act of 1892, or rather of the previous Acts embodied in that statute. In the opinion of the Government, never was it more important than now to grant facilities for rifle practice for Volunteers. If we postpone this legislation, or if we fail to pass it, we shall be taking a very great responsibility on ourselves, and we shall also, I think, be showing great mistrust in the use to which popularly-elected bodies may put the fuller powers they now enjoy. I have indicated, and I think I can prove, that the objects and methods of this Bill are in respect to nine-tenths of it precisely the objects and methods sanctioned by previous legislation, and as regards the remaining tenth I might almost say its provisions are obvious. Of course, I am willing to concede that it is not enough to show in this House that a policy is an old one. It is also necessary, when we are asking for further powers, to show that it is a good one, because there are precedents for reversing a policy instead of confirming or extending it. I ask, is it or is it not a good case to say that local bodies shall co-operate financially in order to assist the Volunteer force? I think it is not difficult to prove that it is. It is sometimes urged—I believe it was urged by the hon. Member for Mid Lanark in 1897—that the whole force of anything and everything which tends towards the additional efficiency of the Volunteers ought to borne by the national taxpayer, and that no part of that burden ought to fall, even for a time or with the consent of the ratepayers, on the local body, or on the funds of the corps. That is a very sweeping proposition, and if we entertain it we shall destroy the legislation of the last thirty-seven years. But I submit it is also a very unreasonable proposition. All the Acts and the present amending Bill are based on two principles, which I think give them a very secure and sound foundation. In the first place experience has shown that the local bodies and the Volunteer corps by joining hands can secure all they want in these matters much more cheaply and effectively than the central Government could if we undertook to carry out the operations for them. In some cases it is a question not of purchasing a large fee simple or a large tract of land, but of purchasing some easement over land, and in a case of that kind the local body can approach the occupier with a much greater chance of success than could some officer sent down from the War Office, whose mere arrival is the signal for a rise in ground values within a measurable area. There are other cases in which the fee-simple must be purchased, and it sometimes happens that the local body practically control the whole of the available area. In some towns you cannot purchase the site for a drill-hall without the co-operation of the town council. On these grounds of principle, convenience, and economy I claim that the experience we have had under the past Acts amply shows that much better results are obtained by allowing the local body to lend its credit under the Public

Works Loans Act. The Volunteer corps cannot, merely by the capitation grant which it earns, compass some of these operations, but it can very well enter into a bargain with the local body, which may really, in the long run, impose no burden whatever on the rates; for the local body, with its power of borrowing from the Public Works Loan Commissioners, can effect a transaction so cheaply that the corps out of its capitation grant is often able to pay both principal and interest. There is another principle on which all this legislation is based. I waive altogether the fact that the councils of many boroughs have come forward and made offers of the most advantageous character to the Volunteer corps. But we believe it is the duty of every district in this country, since we have no conscription weighing upon this land, to take upon itself a fair share of the burden of national defence. It may be said that the county councils are now being carried away by a mere emotion which will evaporate, and that they are embarking on ventures which, when viewed in a cold fit, will no longer be smiled upon by their constituents. I put all that on one side, and I say that the second principle on which this Bill is based is one which has always been accepted—namely, that persons and bodies ought to pay for considerations received. If a town council, as representative of a town, or a county council, as representative of a county, benefits by the construction of a range in a particular locality, then it is only fair they should contribute some portion of the cost. I do not disguise for a moment that the taxpayer has an interest in the provision of ranges and drill-sheds for the use of every efficient Volunteer, but his interest by no means coincides exactly with the interest of the Volunteer or of the town council. The Government in this matter is the trustee for the national taxpayer, and before providing ranges for every Volunteer force, wherever it may be raised, it is bound by the prior claims of the Regulars and the Militia, in the provision of rifle ranges. Owing to the generosity of this House and the patriotic view it has taken of its duty, large sums of public money have been authorised for the construction of ranges for the War Department, and if we deduct from the sum authorised in the Military Works Act, 1897, the amount spent in the acquisition of land on Salisbury Plain, it will be found that £500,000 has been allocated for the construction of ranges. But it is not fair to deduct altogether the sum expended on Salisbury Plain, because there we have erected sixteen rifle ranges, so that half a million of money has been spent or allocated for the provision of rifle ranges, and sixteen additional ranges have been constructed on Salisbury Plain. Until recent times this Government and its predecessors have always maintained that it was not possible or proper for the War Department to directly supply ranges to the Volunteers. We made a departure from that in the Military Works Act of 1899, under which £40,000 was specifically taken in order to provide ranges for the Volunteers, and I may tell the House that it is within the policy of the Government to provide a further sum of £130,000 for the provision of such ranges. But this total expenditure of £170,000 will not enable us to give a range to every Volunteer corps in the country, at its own door or within measurable distance, and if it is to be argued in this House that it is the duty of the national taxpayer to give every Volunteer corps a range within a short distance of its own locality, the burden placed on the country would be out of all proportion to the benefit derived. A great part of the benefit would be derived by individual members of corps and by particular towns, and if the Government is to supply ranges, not only adequate in number, but also in the most convenient places, why then the corollary of that would be that we should have to consider the composition of the Volunteers, the proportion of artillery to infantry, and the distribution of Volunteers all over the country. It would be necessary to make the Volunteers fit the range system, instead of allowing the Volunteers as now to co-operate with the local body in order to arrange a system to suit their own convenience. No Government would make itself responsible for a cut-and-dried constitution of the Volunteer force. They give us the very best available substitute for conscription. Conscription abroad gives a certain amount of military training to every male subject who is mentally and physically fit. Therefore it is not sound policy to say, "We want so many riflemen and so many garrison artillery, and no more." We are bound, if in a certain town a number of artisans come forward and wish to form

an artillery battery, almost to allow the formation of that battery; or, again, if in a certain district the population wished to form a rifle battalion the Department is bound to allow it. But if the argument urged by some is to be accepted, that this having once been done it becomes the immediate duty of the Government, in behalf of the taxpayers, to put a rifle range close beside that battery or battalion, the charge put on the taxpayers would be so monstrous that no one would entertain such a policy for a moment. What would happen? The corps is raised, and then comes the demand from the local body that the corps should go into camp close by the local town. Having raised the corps in this patriotic manner they wish to see their friends exercise quite near them, and to take some part of the indirect emoluments, the pleasure parties, and the trade which are derived from a camp and accruing to the benefit of the locality which has raised the corps. But if this benefit accrues to the locality, then I say it does obtain a consideration, and is bound to contribute a certain amount of the cost. Keeping in view the question of pounds, shillings, and pence, the policy and the proposals of the Bill are very reasonable. It would not suit local bodies if the Government were to say that every corps should have a range, say, within fifty miles, and that they must take their chance as to which corps was to have use of it in turn. It is better that the Government on behalf of the taxpayer, the local corps, and the local body on behalf of the ratepayers should be allowed, as they have been allowed in the past, to come to an arrangement which is for the benefit of all three. That was the object of previous legislation, and that is the object we seek to attain by this Bill. It will give a certain amount of elasticity which is found necessary in the objects contemplated and sanctioned by Parliament. It will be found that the only extension proposed in the first section of the Bill is to authorise local popularly-elected bodies to give and purchase land, and to use the public credit to borrow from the Public Works Loan Commissioners to purchase land for the benefit of the Volunteer force. All that is added by the section is that having done this they may achieve the object they have in view by also lending their credit in order that land may be used for the purpose for which it is bestowed. Unless this is done some of the operations which have been actually entered upon are defeated and rendered of no avail. In 1897 the town council of Hanley gave a site for a Volunteer drill shed. The corps began to build a drill shed on the site, but it was found that the town council could not under the legislation as it now stands transfer to the corps such a title as would enable the corps to use the borrowing powers it enjoys in order to erect a building. There was an absolute *impasse*; the town council had created a perpetual trust on behalf of the corps, which brought none of the benefits to the corps which they intended to give, and the corps is saddled with the useless burden of a site for a drill shed. It was the intention of the consolidating Act of 1892 that such transactions should be carried through successfully to an object which would redound to the benefit of all. That is why we introduce the words "or may contribute." It is a phrase well known to the law. It is used in cases in which local bodies are allowed to assist certain institutions. If local bodies are allowed by the law to assist local corps to get ranges and drill grounds and sheds, then it is only reasonable that we should frame the Act in such a way as to secure the accomplishment of those objects. I intend in Committee to move an Amendment at the end of line 5, inserting the words "at the request and for the benefit of a Volunteer corps." I do not think that they are quite necessary, but as it stands the section may be misunderstood by hon. Members. They may think that the words "for military purposes" cover intentions which do not exist. All the previous legislation and the consolidating Act of 1892 contemplate such assistance being given only to Volunteer corps and Yeomanry corps. Yeomanry corps for the purpose of this legislation come in as they ought to come in as Volunteer corps, all the more since it is evident that the Yeomanry are becoming largely mounted infantry, and not cavalry, and that the rifle will be their arm, and not the lance. In passing the legislation of this amending Bill, all we contemplate is the assistance of local Volunteer or Yeomanry corps by popularly elected bodies. As a matter of fact, they did exist in the earlier draft of the

Bill, but they were omitted under the idea that it might be possible to bring in rifle clubs under the scope of this legislation. That might be a desirable thing, but since there is no provision for rifle clubs in the earlier Acts to provide for the purchase of sites, it is not clear that we can graft them on in this amending Bill, and it will be necessary at a later date to introduce some special enactment for their benefit. Section 2 extends to urban districts the powers which are conferred on county councils and borough councils. Why not? Urban districts of the size of such places as Aston Manor, with a population of 69,000, or Rhondda Valley, with a population of 88,350, electing their own local bodies, should be allowed, if they please, to use the powers conferred upon them by Parliament for the object which Parliament has sanctioned over and over again during thirty-seven years. Section 4 re-enacts a section of the Artillery Rifle Ranges Act. It gives to the First Lord of the Admiralty the powers which were possessed under the previous legislation, and which will be possessed under this Bill by the Secretary of State. Section 5 is also a drafting section, and Section 6 avoids the necessity of passing a special enactment for each Provisional Order passed under the Military Lands Act, 1892, a necessity which has arisen from some obscurity in the drafting of the Act. Section 7 applies the Act to Scotland, and Section 8 provides that the measure is to be construed as part of the consolidating Act of 1892. The House will see that the measure, therefore, is strictly an amending Act to the consolidating Act of 1892. I think the House will feel that facilities ought to be given for the acquisition of rifle ranges, and that it is our duty to remedy defects, to grant the extensions which are necessary, if the objects contemplated in previous statutes are to be effectively attained.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Wyndham.*)

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid): I will not follow the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary through the previous legislation: I take my stand wholly upon the Military Lands Act of 1892, which, as he says, was a consolidating statute, and which is the existing law. A great deal of what the Under Secretary has said in regard to the powers granted by previous Acts is not embraced within the Act of 1892. He has told us that nine-tenths of the powers asked for under this Bill are embraced in older Acts. If that is so, there is no need for these nine-tenths, but only for the remaining tenth. I would point out that there is nothing whatever in the Act of 1892 that gives the slightest countenance to the things proposed in this Bill. The Act of 1892 was a consolidating statute passed through this House at the end of a session, and, indeed, within a very few days of the prorogation. There was no discussion on it, and the only two Amendments made in Committee were moved on behalf of the Government—one formal, and the other to omit "etc." The legislation of 1892 was therefore the production of the Unionist Government itself, so that whatever praise or blame attaches to that Act attaches to Her Majesty's Government. If the Act has been faulty, that faulty legislation must be laid at the door of Her Majesty's Government. The Military Lands Act of 1892 only dealt with the acquisition of land for military purposes; and the Act defines what military purposes are. They include rifle and artillery ranges, the erection of butts, targets, batteries, and accommodation for the storing of arms for military drill, and other purposes connected with military matters approved by the Secretary of State for War. It is, however, important to note that the Act did not, and does not, authorise the acquisition of land by local authorities for butts, targets, batteries, drill-halls, or other permanent works. The parties who are authorised by that Act to acquire land for military purposes are, first, the Secretary of State for War, who, however, can always acquire all the land for military purposes that he requires. That power is unlimited, and there is no intention on the part of the opponents of this Bill to limit in any measure the power of the Secretary of State for War to erect whatever works he considers necessary. The second body authorised to acquire land are Volunteer corps, with the consent of the Secretary of State; and the third, the council of a county or a borough, which may, at the request of one or more Volunteer corps, purchase and hold land in behalf of these Volunteer corps for military purposes. Now in the case of purchase by the Secretary of State the money is, of course, provided by Parlia-

ment, but in the case of purchase by Volunteer corps, the corps may raise the money by way of loan from the Public Works Loan Commission on the security of the land so acquired, and secondly on that of the grant to the corps provided by Parliament. Now the loans by the Public Works Loan Commissioners are to be repayable within a period of fifty years, and the interest is not to be more than 3½ per cent., subject to Clause 1 of the Public Loans Act. There is no question as to my facts.

MR. WYNDHAM: I rely on the same facts, and I pointed out that this Bill gave reasonable extension.

MR. CALDWELL: Then as far as regards land acquired by the Secretary of State, no matter whether the land is acquired for military purposes or not, it is under the control of the Secretary of State, and he can make bye-laws for the protection of the public, etc., and, in short, have full control. Now when a Volunteer corps is disbanded, what is to become of the butts, and building, and the land? You find that when a Volunteer corps is disbanded, if they have acquired land for military purposes and put buildings upon the land, they have no interest whatever in those buildings or the land; the whole goes to the Secretary of State. So that you are asking a Volunteer corps to contribute money for a purpose for which they have the privilege of paying; but when the purpose is served and the land is sold they are to have no right to the money which they have advanced either for the purpose of acquiring the and or for erecting buildings upon it. Where land has been acquired by a Volunteer corps by means of a loan through the borough council, and the Volunteer corps is disbanded before the borough council can appropriate or sell the land, it must be offered to the original owner at a sum to be fixed by arbitration. And we all know perfectly well that on a price to be fixed by arbitration butts and embankments and other military objects which have ceased to be used will not be said to be of any value, but, on the contrary, will be said to depreciate the value of the land. The Act contemplates, of course, use by the public of the land when it is not required for military purposes, so that it will also form an open space, and there is always eventual value in such a property when it ceases to be used for military purposes. Those are reasonable considerations why a local authority should embark in the process of purchasing land in a locality where the land would eventually be valuable to the locality, but butts, rifle ranges, embankments, and drill sheds for military purposes are of no use when they cease to be required for military purposes. There is not much risk to run in acquiring land for military purposes by an easy method of payment extending over fifty years; but it is quite a different thing to do what this Bill proposes to do, to ask a Volunteer corps, on the faith of a local authority, to expend money in all these things, which, when they are no longer used, only depreciate the land, and not repay them the money they have advanced. There is one subject which the Under Secretary in his *résumé* did not deal with. He did not deal with the Bill of 1897. If he had looked at that Bill and the state in which it passed he might have seen something to call his attention to the reason why opposition to this Bill was likely to take place. As the Volunteers Act limited the Volunteers and borough councils to acquiring land, the present Government brought in a Bill which was practically word for word Clause 1 of this Bill. It was said that the only object of that Bill was to make plain the Act of 1892, which was meant to give powers to build as well as to acquire land. But the Bill of 1892 did not do that. Now what became of the Bill of 1897? It came up early in the session of 1897 and was opposed, and eventually, in order to get it through, the Government had to submit to a compromise which I had some little hand in carrying through, and the effect of that compromise was that they had to eliminate everything with regard to the councils that would place a penny of expense on the local rates. In that modified form the Government consented to take the Bill, and it passed through the House and it received the Royal Assent early in the session. That being the result of the Bill of 1897 brought in by the Government, can it be supposed that the people who strenuously opposed that Bill would not oppose this, which not only proposes to do everything that the Bill of 1897 did, but proceeds still further in the same direction? Clause 1 of this Bill not only reopens the whole of the questions in the

Bill of 1897, but Clauses 2, 3, and 4 introduce new matter of a highly controversial nature. I admire the courage of the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary for War, but if the right hon. Gentleman the present Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs, then Under Secretary for War, felt bound to abandon an attempt to burden the local rates in this manner, how does the present Under Secretary for War hope to carry through this Bill this session? The Volunteer corps, who may have contributed three-fourths or nine-tenths, are to have no share or interest whatever in the buildings the moment the corps is disbanded, or after the buildings have ceased to be used for military purposes. Will the Under Secretary of State for War tell us where the Volunteers get the funds for the erection of these buildings and butts? I think they will understand at the War Office, from the Estimates, what money is given for the purpose of erecting butts and targets for Volunteers. That is quite a distinct purpose, and if money is given for that purpose Parliament should give it directly. Let the land be in the name of the Secretary of State for War; let it be subject to his control, and let him be responsible. Supposing you do not get a shilling from a local authority or a Volunteer corps, what is to hinder you from coming to this House and getting every penny you require for the erection of butts, targets, or anything else for military purposes? That is the proper course, and one advantage of it is that you can take it with the most perfect confidence, without having to consult any local authority or without being influenced by any local authority in the matter. You can act in this matter quite independently, because you do not require to consider whether, as regards the site of a rifle range, a certain local body is willing to contribute so much money. Your duty is to consider, in the interest of the Volunteer corps, where the most suitable place would be for a rifle range or the other works for military purposes. I cannot understand where a Volunteer corps is to get the money. Is it to come out of their own money? I have heard complaints that the Volunteers get too little money and require more. I have never voted against any proposal to increase the Vote to the Volunteers; and it appears to me strange that we should have appeals for more money to the Volunteers, and at the same time attempt to pass this Bill, the object of which is to impose on Volunteers the burden of providing rifle ranges and all these other things. There is also this to be said, that a Volunteer corps may hypothecate and pledge in security of their loan from the Public Works Loan Commissioners the Government grant-in-aid which is given for other purposes. Where can be the morality of a transaction of this sort? It puts me in mind of what was done in the case of Ireland, when grants-in-aid to local authorities for the poor and the insane were pledged in security of the payment of certain advances under the Land Purchase Act. That was always considered on this side of the House a most immoral thing to do. I venture to say that no grants are given to the Volunteers or anybody else except for necessary purposes. I find it is proposed that these grants may be pledged for a purpose altogether foreign to those for which the money was specially granted. Observe why this burden is placed on the Volunteers. Simply because it so happens that a certain community are very patriotic and loyal and raise one or more Volunteer corps. Because, forsooth, they happen to do that they are to be called upon to contribute more for military purposes, whilst other districts with an equal or greater population are not to be asked to contribute a single shilling of these expenses. The principle is utterly unsound. Then we come to the power to be conferred on the council of any county or borough. The principle is not a whit more defensible, where it is proposed that the council of any county or borough—

> "May maintain and adapt for use, by the erection of buildings or otherwise, or may contribute towards the maintenance or adaptation for use of, any land held for military purposes, and for this purpose may borrow, [and the Public Works Loan Commissioners may lend] in like manner as they may [respectively] borrow [and lend] for the purpose of acquiring land under the Military Lands Act, 1892."

The land is not vested in the county or borough council at all, and it might eventually fall into the hands of the Secretary of State for War. Then they are to borrow the money on the security of the county rate or the borough rate. The purposes for which the money is to be applied are essentially military in their character. There is nothing local as regards its uses. It is rather strange to find this proposal to saddle local autho-

rities with the upkeep of things which are essentially for Imperial military purposes, when these local authorities receive out of the Imperial funds grants to mitigate the burden of the local rates. The people who stand in need of assistance for local purposes are to have handed over to them by this Bill a burden for works which are essentially of a military character. They are to be asked to bear this expense because they happen to be exceptionally loyal and patriotic in the way of raising Volunteer corps. They require rifle ranges for the purpose of making themselves efficient. The ranges are only useful to the Volunteers in training for the national defence. Are not the men giving their time and their leisure for the purpose of making themselves efficient? Yet you would say to them, "Oh, these things are being done for your benefit, and therefore you should pay part of the expense." There is one essential thing with regard to all methods of local rating, and that is that the control of the purpose for which the rates are levied should remain with the local authority. That is why I called attention to the fact at an earlier part of my remarks that this land would be entirely under the control and at the mercy of the Secretary of State for War, and not under local control in any shape or form. You are asking the local authority to tax the ratepayers, while another body outside and independent of them will have the whole power over the expenditure of the money. The local authority will have no say. That is contrary to the principle of local government, which is that everything should be under the control of the representatives of the people in the local council. Clause 2 goes a great deal further than was proposed in 1897. It provides—

"The powers exerciseable by a borough council under the Military Lands Act, 1892, and this Act may be exercised by the council of any urban district, and any expenses incurred by the council of an urban district other than a borough in the execution of those powers shall be defrayed as part of their general expenses incurred in the execution of the Public Health Acts, and any money borrowed by the council for the execution of those powers shall be borrowed in accordance with the provisions of those Acts, and may be lent by the Public Works Loan Commissioners."

This power of the urban district council is open to all the objections I have stated with regard to the granting of similar powers to the council of a county or borough. But there is this further objection, that in the case of the urban district council the expenses are to be defrayed as public health expenses. I daresay the Under Secretary for War is aware of what the effect of that would be. All the moneys which may be borrowed for military purposes will be computed as part of the borrowings under the Public Health Act, with the result that the amount of the borrowing power, which is limited under that Act to two years of the annual value of the property, may be eaten up for these military purposes, and nothing may be left for the necessary public health purposes. That shows that you will even put the military purposes before the necessary public health purposes. This Bill makes no provision whatever for consulting the parishioners on the question of the expenditure of the money. You put no limit to the borrowing powers, and in this case there is no limit to the extent to which a locality may be rated. The local rating has quite a different incidence of taxation from Imperial rating. In the case of local rating, under the present system you have to make land the assessable commodity, and, in England particularly, the rates are paid wholly by the occupier. There is therefore this curious result in the Bill, that in the case of an urban district council in England the rates will be paid wholly by the occupier, while in the case of Scotland the rates will be paid half by the owner and half by the occupier. If the country is being invaded, who gets the benefit of the defence against that invasion? Surely the owners of landed property and property of all kinds, as well as the occupiers, will get the benefit, and why should the burden of making provision for national defence be placed upon the occupiers only in the case of England? I take it that by giving this power to local authorities there is no intention of having anything done which is not necessary. We may therefore assume that these buildings are all necessary for military purposes. That being so, I ask on what principle the occupier only, the shopkeeper who pays an inordinate share of local rates, should be assessed in this way, while another man, who may have a large income, but only a small rateable value, pays a very small amount? National defence ought to be paid for out of the Imperial purse, in regard to which the contributions are

fixed upon the nation as a whole according to what Parliament in its wisdom thinks a proper division, without reference to local considerations. Obviously, the Imperial system of taxation is the best and fairest. Volunteer corps are having these ranges for the purpose of practising for the defence not of particular localities, but of the country as a whole, and there is not a single element of local needs in the matter. Clause 3 introduces a still more objectionable system, namely, that of hiring land—an altogether novel system—for military purposes. The land is to be hired under Sections 9 and 10 of the Local Government Act, 1894.

MR. WYNDHAM said it was proposed to omit that provision.

MR. CALDWELL: That certainly does away with that objection. In Clause 4 you introduce a principle which is somewhat novel in its character, and if a novel principle is introduced we expect that that principle should be introduced when there is ample opportunity for its discussion, and not at the tail end of a session. Some parts are, of course, quite unobjectionable. There is no objection to the Navy having the same powers of making bye-laws for land acquired for naval purposes as the military authorities have, but you touch a most delicate matter when you begin to apply to the sea the same elements of power that you have upon land. If you interfere with any private right, it comes under the Lands Clauses Act; you take care that the landed proprietor shall get his full pound of flesh in such an event; but observe what is done when you deal with public rights. I venture to say the Under Secretary gave us no authority whatever for this mode of dealing with public rights on the sea. In Sub-section 4 "public right" is described as—

"the right of navigation, grounding, anchoring, fishing, bathing, walking, or recreation."

Fishing, for example, I think is most important.

MR. WYNDHAM said the words were already on the Statute-book.

MR. CALDWELL: I am referring to dealing with the sea.

MR. WYNDHAM referred to the Act of 1885.

MR. CALDWELL: At any rate, under this Bill you claim rights of a most extensive character as regards the sea. You do not limit yourselves to the three-mile limit; and you take powers to dispense with those permanent marks which are necessary under the military clause. The powers here sought may seriously affect fishermen, and it must be remembered that this Act applies not only to Scotland and England, but also to Ireland. How are the public rights of fishing and anchoring disposed of here? In the case of a man with a value of £50 at stake, he will get compensation under the Lands Clauses Act, but in the case of a public right of this kind, the whole thing will be given away by the approval of the Board of Trade. One Government Department is to sit in judgment on another Government Department; they may adjudicate upon and sign away the public interest to-morrow, as far as this Bill is concerned. Moreover, there is no redress. If ever there was a case for having a Provisional Order which should come before the House, this would be that case. It is not a case of emergency; it is a matter in which there is plenty of time to make your arrangements and to know your policy; you cannot acquire lands and erect buildings all in a day. It is altogether unreasonable to expect that the Board of Trade should have the right to interfere in this way with the sea and the use of the sea. All I have to say with regard to this Bill is this: that the Under Secretary of State for War seemed to think that if we refuse the powers asked for in this Bill, we will in some way impair the national defence. There never was a grosser mistake than that. The contention here is that if these military works are necessary they ought not to be provided at the expense of the local authority. If they are really necessary, then let the Government make their arrangements and come down to this House and ask for whatever they require for military purposes. The Government would then get the money without being hampered by any local authority, and it is absurd to say that if we reject this Bill we shall prevent the carrying out of any of these military requirements. My suggestion gives you the biggest purse, and we do not ask you to be hampered by the parsimony of any local authority in providing a rifle-butt which is not sufficient, but which is, perhaps, as much as their means will allow. Instead of relying upon the local authority, who ought not to contribute out of the rates, we ask you to

come to the Imperial purse and get any money you require. I move that the Bill be read a second time this day three months.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs): I rise to second this motion, for the purpose of getting a reply from the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary to the important points made by my hon. friend. Previous legislation of this kind has dealt only with land, but this Bill deals not only with land but also with the buildings on the land and other things which do not necessarily belong to the land. Such things ought to come within the purview of the Imperial Government, and should not be put upon local authorities. I entirely agree with my hon. friend when he says that he has not the least desire to minimise or prevent these facilities being given to local rifle corps. The object he has in view is that Imperial funds shall be applied for Imperial purposes, and that no demand should be made upon the local rates for objects which ought to be paid for out of the Imperial purse. I am sure the hon. Gentleman will agree that the House has made a most generous provision at all times whenever it has been called upon by the present Government for military purposes. I have heard that acknowledged over and over again. I have never opposed any provision whatever which has been made for the Volunteers. My own opinion is that the Government have done too little rather than too much for this very useful force. It is not in the faintest degree any opposition to the interests of the Volunteers that has actuated our opposition to this Bill; but, on the other hand, it is a desire that the Volunteer force shall not be crippled in any respect, because one cannot expect that local authorities will pay the same attention to Volunteer regiments as the Imperial authority is able to do. There is another point which my hon. friend raised, which I think deserves the attention of the House. For purposes of this kind we should have complete equality of taxation as between county and county and district and district. This duty is one which lies upon all, irrespective altogether of the place in which they live, and in cases of this kind it is only right that the common purse should be used. Another very important point made by my hon. friend was that the land would remain under the control of the Secretary of State, and not in any way under the control of the local authority; and, moreover, if it ceased to be necessary to use the property, the council would only be able to obtain the unpaid instalments due upon it. There is another point which has also been very properly raised, and it is that money for these purposes will be raised under the Public Health Act, and as the borrowing powers of a council are limited under this Act, and as the purposes for which money is needed under this Act are continually increasing, it would unduly limit the borrowing capacity of an urban or county council if it was found necessary to borrow for military purposes under the Public Health Act. The hon. Member opposite hinted that we had a jealous mistrust of popularly elected bodies exercising these new powers. I should like to know where any jealous mistrust exists on this side of the House of the way in which popularly elected bodies use their powers? We have tried over and over again to obtain further powers for popularly elected bodies, and when the Local Government Act of 1888 was passing the House, attempt after attempt was made to enlarge the powers of local authorities by hon. Members on this side of the House. Therefore it is not from this side of the House that any jealous mistrust of that kind comes, but we do mistrust any raid upon the pockets of the local ratepayers for purposes of this kind. It was certainly not from this side of the House that any opposition came to place the whole of the police entirely under the control of local authorities. We do not jealously mistrust these local authorities, but what we say is that it is not the business of these local authorities to spend money for this particular purpose. We say, moreover, that there are certain powers now exercised by the local authorities which ought to be taken over by the Imperial authority. For instance, there is the work of port sanitary authorities, which really does not belong to the local authorities at all, but belongs more properly to the Imperial Government. We consider that local authorities stand in such need of assistance that we give them £12,000,000 or £13,000,000 a year by way of aiding the local rates. The policy now proposed is inconsistent, and for military purposes strictly Imperial in their character the local purse ought not to be drawn upon. There is one other matter to which I

should like to draw the attention of the House for one moment. I was glad that the hon. Gentleman stated that the Bill is to refer only to Volunteers, and for these particular purposes. The position we take up with regard to this Bill is simply that the demand which the Government now make upon the House is to enable local authorities to do work which ought to be done by the Imperial Parliament out of the Imperial Treasury. It is neither just nor fair to call upon local authorities to do this work. At times of great and patriotic excitement there is nobody who wishes to refuse anything that is asked for in this House, and it is the duty of the Imperial Government to carry out this work. We are willing to do all you ask us in order to make the Volunteer force more efficient, and you are not likely, so far as I am concerned, to meet with the slightest difficulty in that direction. I think you might do a great deal more for the Volunteer force to make it effective, but I venture to say that such a proposal as this is not the right way to go about it. Work of this kind should not be put upon local authorities, and matters of Imperial concern ought to be dealt with by the Imperial Parliament.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

*MR. MONK (Gloucester): I rise for the purpose of expressing my great satisfaction with the Government for bringing in this Bill, and I hope it is their intention to carry it into law. I have listened for a good hour to the speech of the hon. Member for Mid Lanark, and I confess that I was greatly surprised at his line of argument. The hon. Member who has just seconded the motion took a similar line of argument, which is to the effect that the Government ought to provide for everything which is required for the Volunteer corps. For years past the Volunteers throughout the country have been asking the Government for assistance in providing rifle ranges, and two years ago a little flutter was caused when the Government brought in and passed an Act in which provision was made for acquiring rifle ranges in different parts of the country. When, however, the Volunteers asked for a portion of the money allotted for them they were met with this answer—namely, that the whole of that sum would have to be expended in providing rifle ranges for the use of the regular forces. In many parts of the country, and in the county of Gloucester especially, the rifle ranges are far too distant from the head quarters of the Volunteer corps. I heard with great satisfaction from my hon. friend this afternoon that a further sum of £130,000 is to be applied for the purpose of providing rifle ranges for Volunteers. In the case of the rifle corps in my own county, the corporation of the city I have the honour to represent expressed their desire to co-operate with the Government as far as possible in providing these rifle ranges, and I was astonished to hear hon. Gentlemen opposite expressing reluctance to authorise the local authorities to assist in providing ranges. They seem to overlook the fact that the local authorities are under no obligation to take action under this Bill, but I cannot understand on what ground hon. Gentlemen opposite refuse to grant to the elected representatives of district urban councils and town councils permission, under the authority of Parliament, to assist in providing these ranges. I only desire to express the hope that the Government will pass this Bill, for I am sure that the step they have taken is one which will be greatly appreciated by the Volunteers throughout the country.

MR. MAURICE HEALY (Cork): I do not rise to take part in this debate because I feel the smallest interest in the subject of the Volunteer force, or the rifle ranges with which they are to be provided. The Government are afraid to permit Volunteers being established in Ireland, and accordingly, so far as this Bill deals with Volunteers, it has not the smallest interest for me. The reason I take part in this debate is that on a former occasion when this House took an opportunity of dealing with this subject of rifle ranges for Volunteers the War Office played what I can only describe as a very despicable trick on the public of the three kingdoms, and especially of the country to which I belong. I am not in the habit of using excessive language, but I think when the House hears what was done on that occasion it will not be astonished that I have characterised it as I have. In 1891 one of the most im-

portant of these Acts was passed. It was called "An Act to facilitate the acquisition of ranges by Volunteer corps and others," and any Irish Member reading that title, and knowing as we all know that Volunteers are impossible in Ireland, might well have assumed that the Bill had no application to Ireland, and also that it only dealt with the subject of rifle ranges and nothing else. What are the facts? Under that Act the War Office, in breach of the rules of this House, and in breach of the confidence which should exist between Members of the House and the Government, introduced a section depriving the public of these kingdoms for the first time of having the compensation, to which they were entitled when their property was taken away from them by the Crown, fixed by a jury. Until that Act was passed, when the Crown interfered with private property and took it over for rifle ranges or for any other purpose of military defence, it was the right of the subject to have the compensation to which he was entitled assessed by a jury of his countrymen, but into this Bill facilitating the acquisition of ranges for Volunteer corps a clause was introduced not limited to rifle ranges, but enabling the War Department, whenever they took property in any part of the United Kingdom for any purpose, to have the compensation assessed, not by a jury, but in another mode, and that section was applied to Ireland. When the War Office had to take a large tract of land in the county of Cork from the statutory tenant, who, under the Land Act, has practically a fee-simple subject to a rent, they proposed to have the amount of compensation assessed by two paid removable magistrates, paid employees of the Government, who might be dismissed at a moment's notice.

*MR. SPEAKER: I do not find any reference to the Act of 1891 in this Bill.

MR. MAURICE HEALY: Oh, yes, Sir; I shall show that what I am saying is perfectly relevant.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Act of 1891 was repealed by the Act of 1892.

MR. MAURICE HEALY: That is the point. It was repealed save the one clause to which I have been referring, and which was foisted into a Bill with which it had nothing to do, thereby practising a fraud on the House and the country. I say respectfully that these Military Land Bills are becoming a public nuisance and a public danger. We never seem to be done with them. They began to be passed in 1842, and I will not venture to say how many of them have been passed since then. But it now appears to be the practice that we are to have a Military Lands Bill every session, just as we have an Expiring Laws Continuance Bill. When are we to be done with them? Very few people are acquainted with them. The average Member of Parliament cannot be supposed to understand them, and neither can the average lawyer, because they do not come within the scope of his ordinary practice, and when one of these Military Land Bills is introduced no one except a member of the Government has any cognisance of what it may contain. It is that which enables the War Department to practise its deceit on the House of Commons and the country, as was perpetrated in the Act of 1891. I think we are entitled to ask that the last word should some time or other be said on the subject of taking land from private owners in a compulsory manner for the purposes of military defence. About thirty of these Acts have been passed, and the unfortunate lawyer who is concerned with the subject has to wade through them all. It is not a subject that is treated in the ordinary textbooks, and the lawyer who has to deal with a case has perhaps to read twenty or thirty of these Acts before he knows how the rights of his client may be affected. Why do we not have one single Act, compressed into a reasonable compass and in an accessible form, showing the powers of the Government on the subject? It is a matter in which we in Ireland are very deeply interested. I asked the Financial Secretary of the War Office a question about a project for taking some four miles of territory in the heart of the county Cork for an addition to the Kilworth rifle range. We did not object to these ranges being set up in Cork, although they involved a considerable displacement of the people, but surely there must be some limitation. As I understood the hon. Gentleman, the original proposal would bring about the eviction of about thirty to forty families. That may be very well in England, because when a farmer is turned out of his land he gets compensation, and he can invest his money in a way that will bring him his living. But in Ireland, when a

man is turned out of his holding, he has nothing to do but go to America. When I asked the hon. Gentleman a question on the subject he first contradicted me flatly, and if I had not had some acquaintance with the matter, I would have been deceived by his denial, although I am sure he did not intend that.

*THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Mr. J. POWELL-WILLIAMS, Birmingham, S.): The hon. Gentleman is referring to an answer I gave him a little while ago, and I then informed him that it was never intended to permanently purchase for the purpose of a rifle range the land near Kilworth to which he refers.

MR. MAURICE HEALY: My complaint is that the answer of the hon. Gentleman would have had the effect of deceiving me if I had not been acquainted with the subject, and I venture to say that when Members of this House ask questions they ought to expect answers giving full information, and not answers which amount to a deceit upon them, though of course the hon. Gentleman did not intend that result. There ought to be no hugger-mugger about taking four miles of land for military purposes, and when questions are asked they ought to be answered frankly, and we should not be put off with an answer such as that given to me by the hon. Gentleman at first. He gave me further information when he saw I had it already, but if I had not had it I would have been deceived by the flat denial he gave me. I am sure it was a truthful answer, but it was an answer which had the effect of an untruth, and that is not the sort of answer I desire to get. That illustrates in a remarkable way the difficulties which are involved in these Bills. I will give another illustration of the hardship under which the subject is placed by these Military Land Bills. When the Crown proceeds to take land, litigation is in effect set up between the subject and the Government. The Government can command the best legal advice, whereas the unfortunate occupant whose property is being taken away may be very poor, and even absolutely destitute. That man is placed in a position of being a litigant against the Crown. In a particular case I have in my mind, one of the litigants against the Crown succeeded in establishing in the Queen's Bench in Ireland that the procedure set on foot by the Crown was wholly wrong, and that the Crown were not entitled to do what they were attempting. If an ordinary litigant proceeds against me, and I succeed, I am entitled to get my costs; but when I am a litigant against the Crown the Crown is fighting on velvet, and even if I succeed I cannot get any costs, but if the Crown wins it gets its costs against the subject. I intend for my part to take every opportunity which this Bill will afford to endeavour to effect some reform in this branch of the law. It is quite time some check were put on the extraordinary powers now exercised by the War Office. They are able to fight with all the resources of the Treasury at their back, and when an ordinary litigant gets the advantage of them, and is proved to be right, he nevertheless has to pay his own costs.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I desire to say one word as regards this Bill, not only as a Volunteer —in which capacity I support it in the strongest possible manner—but also as one of the Members representing a great corporation. My right hon. friend the Member for the Ecclesall Division, and myself, have been requested by the Corporation of Sheffield to do all we can to obtain all possible facilities for supporting and encouraging the Volunteers. The Corporation of Nottingham and other corporations have also recognised that it is their duty, if they possibly can, to give facilities for the drill exercise and rifle shooting of Volunteers within their districts. Many of the residents in the great towns are now anxious to follow that example, and to do away with the scandal of having a great force in this country without adequate provision for drill, and without convenient rifle ranges, at a time when so much depends on the accuracy of rifle shooting. The rifle ranges are now removed too far from the Volunteers, and are difficult of access. They do not afford sufficient scope for the use of modern arms, and there is not sufficient space behind the targets. I think landowners are now anxious to fall in with public sentiment, and much must be done in this direction if we are to amend our position. There is something to be said for the suggestion of the hon. Member for Cork that the Government ought to incorporate all these Acts in one compre-

hensive measure. We are grateful to the Government for having recognised what has been so often impressed on them—that facilities should be given for the training and exercise of Volunteer corps, and that no impediment should be placed in the way of any of the great corporations of the country advancing money for such a desirable, useful, and patriotic purpose. I beg to thank the hon. Gentleman who has introduced this Bill. I trust the Government will persevere with it and that on no account will they consent to any modification in any essential particular.

*Mr. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.): I should like to say a few words on this Bill, as I have repeatedly drawn attention to the necessity for making provision for the rifle practice of the Volunteers. The hon. and gallant Gentleman who has just spoken speaks on behalf of a very wealthy corporation, and a corporation which has a direct interest in the Volunteer movement. I do not wish to reflect in any way on the patriotism of Sheffield, but it is perfectly obvious that in that corporation there may be rather a strong feeling in favour of the expenditure of public money on the Volunteer movement.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT: We do not make rifles. We ought to, but we do not.

*Mr. CHANNING: Perhaps I may have stretched that argument further than it is worth, but hon. Gentlemen will see that possibly a corporation like Sheffield may have a motive in aiding the Volunteers which may not exist in other parts of the country. It seems to me that we ought to consider other parts of the country, and reflect what would be the result, or rather the failure to produce any result, of a Bill like this. I imagine in many agricultural districts there will be great reluctance to call upon the rates for these purposes, and also in many of the heavily rated towns throughout the country. What I have already said will show the Under Secretary for War that I am not out of sympathy with the proposals of the Bill, so far as they go towards extending the power of the local authorities. But it seems to me that the proper form in which to pass a Bill of this nature would be to introduce amendments enabling the Exchequer to make such advances as may be necessary to facilitate the provision of ranges wherever they may be needed. I do not think this Bill will be worth the paper on which it is printed in a great many parts of the country if there is no Imperial subvention to it. I admit we may do this as a matter of local duty to a certain extent, but surely the main argument we have to consider is the extension of the Volunteer movement as an effective instrument for the defence of the country. I therefore say that my hon. friend the Member for Mid Lanark was amply justified in urging the necessity of providing out of public funds for this purpose. Owing to the continuous increase in land values it is impossible for Volunteers to provide these ranges for themselves, and even local authorities may find it difficult, owing to the rapidly increasing value of land. The upshot therefore will probably be that where there are no rich corporations like Sheffield, nothing will be done in the matter, and it seems to me that it is an Imperial duty to do what we can to assist the Volunteer movement. I have always fought against the idea of treating the Volunteer movement as merely a means of providing a certain number of men who may be turned into useful recruits for the regular Army. The Volunteers ought to be treated as an integral part of our system of defence, and developed on those lines. Having regard to these facts, the plain duty of the Government is to introduce a clause providing that the Exchequer shall aid the local authorities in these matters. So far as I am aware, in the provision made last year, nothing was done beyond making an additional allowance to enable Volunteers to attend rifle ranges, and, in the emergency scheme of February last, aid was to be given as to transport and new guns, but not as to ranges.

*Colonel PILKINGTON (Lancashire, Newton): I hope the Government will pass this Bill. As regards Sheffield and other districts we must remember that the bulk of the Volunteer force is recruited from such large centres of population. This Bill is really to enable local bodies to provide, or assist in providing, rifle ranges, drill halls, and drill grounds. Very often corporations or local authorities have the means, without any or with hardly any expense to themselves, to assist in providing these. I know one place, with which I am intimately con-

nected, where something like twenty acres have been provided, the use of which is to be given for drilling the Volunteers at such times and hours as may be convenient to the corporation. There is another direction in which the Volunteer force may be assisted. If an individual, endowed with public spirit, may assist his country by providing rifle ranges and drill halls, why should not the community be allowed, if they feel the same spirit, to grant that encouragement to the Volunteers? It is thought that the rifle meeting at Bisley this year has not been what it should be because the rifle ranges throughout the country have not been equal to the requirements of the force. It seems to me that this is a practical enabling measure, and I trust that it will be unanimously and quickly passed through the House.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): I am not surprised that my hon. friend behind me should have made an elaborate onslaught on this Bill. In the first place, the Bill is of a somewhat confused character, and it shares the charm of a good deal of the legislation to which we are accustomed nowadays, in that it embodies so much reference to one statute and another. There is so much cryptographic matter in the whole of our legislation that it is very difficult for plain men to understand what it all means; and I am bound to say, even after the hon. Gentleman's speech, that I do not altogether understand this Bill. At the same time my hon. friend was very naturally led to point to one result of this kind of legislation—namely, that it tends to place a portion of national defence in a somewhat undue degree on certain shoulders while securing immunity for others. Sheffield may be taken as an example. Sheffield is very patriotic, enterprising, and enthusiastic, and it is willing to spend money on the Volunteers. In doing this the town voluntarily, and in a praiseworthy spirit, makes a contribution to the defence of these islands which is greater in proportion than it ought to be called upon to pay. The expenses of the Volunteers ought to be a national and Imperial cost, as far as it falls upon the public at all, and not a local cost. I have always thought that it was rather a shabby thing to say to localities, when they were claiming to be defended by forts and fixed defences, that they should subscribe or show that they were willing to bear a part of the cost of the defence works. I know that that argument was used to the city of Edinburgh, and I have always thought, although I have used it myself, that it was an extraordinary argument to employ. Probably the same thing might be said of my hon. friend's indictment of this Bill. But at the same time I hope that my hon. friend will not divide the House against the Bill. I would press upon him this fact, that the action taken by the municipalities and public bodies is entirely voluntary; if they do not choose to take part in this public service to the Volunteers they need not do so. That takes away the greater part of the sting of his attack. There may be defects in the Bill which can be cured or modified, but in the main I think that the House generally will sympathise with the general object of the Bill. It is somewhat singular to find that in 1897 this identical proposal was put forward by the Government, and at the very hey-day of the session they were obliged to drop it owing to the strong feeling against it. This feeling does not appear to be so strong in the present dog days. My attitude towards the Bill I must confesss is that I think this is not the time for the House to deal with a comparatively small matter; that the War Office would be much better employed with the heavy duties connected with actual warfare, and that the Department might very well leave these legislative proposals to be dealt with in quieter times. That is my view, and it applies to this Bill as well as to others. But the Bill, owing to its purely voluntary character, is not likely to cause any great injustice in any part of the kingdom. If it does anything to facilitate the training and increase the efficiency of the Volunteers, then I think that these are objects which the House as a whole will be ready to further and aid.

MR. WYNDHAM: I feel I must express my obligations to the right hon. Gentleman for having given me practically his support in the passage of this measure. I know that he includes this in a certain category of Bills, which he tells us we ought not to have undertaken at this time. He says these are small measures, and they should be postponed till after the war is over, and until we can address ourselves to the task of making the British Army adequate to any calls that can be made upon it. I do

not think that argument ought to weigh much. It reminds me of a practice which I myself often indulge in—namely, of putting off writing letters on Monday because I have to prepare a speech for Tuesday. The best way of placing the Government in a proper position to deal with the grave questions to be faced, is to pass amending Bills to ensure perfect legislation of the character which has been described. It is true that the Bill contains a great deal of legislation by reference. It refers back to the Military Lands Act of 1892, and that refers to the Lands Clauses Compensation Act and various others. I admit that I have often denounced legislation by reference, but I have become somewhat converted to the practice, and I think that there is a great deal to be said for it. After all, the powers of purchasing and borrowing possessed by the local bodies are familiar to them; they know the provisions in the Act under which they exercise these powers, and it is far more simple to refer the authorities back to the Acts than to recite the same powers over again. If you recite them over again you sometimes raise a doubt. In law, as in travel, the shortest way is the way you know. If I am to meet the objections urged by the hon. Member for Mid Lanark I would only repeat the arguments which I ventured to submit earlier in the afternoon. I do not think that as things are it can be fairly urged that the whole cost of the efficiency of the Volunteers should necessarily be borne by the taxpayers, and that no part should be borne by the ratepayers. Certainly the Government, as representing the taxpayer, ought to see that every corps should have reasonable access to a range; but many corps and many councils wish for more than that. They wish the annual camp, perhaps, to be in the park near the town, and they wish to have a range near that park; and the mayor and corporation come to the Government and say: "We are quite prepared to spend a certain amount of money in providing a range if you will allow the Volunters and the Yeomanry to come out and camp in the park." There is the consideration for both parties, and why should not each party pay for such consideration as it asks for? I am authorised by the Chancellor of the Exchequer to say that £70,000 of the taxpayers' money will be found for the scheme, and local authorities will contribute the other £70,000 for advantages received. That is my defence of the principle which underlies the Bill, and I must adhere to my opinion.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): I observe the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary for War has sat down without making a single observation in regard to the charges of oppression made under the Consolidating Military Lands Act in Ireland. It is all very fine for you to bring in a Bill dealing with your own country, and with your own affairs, and it is all very fine for you to be patriotic, but why should you rob us? That is precisely what the Military Lands Act has done ever since it was first passed. It is a remarkable fact that this is a Bill which nobody can understand. Certainly it is the first time I have known you, Mr. Speaker, to have arrived at a ruling that a Bill was so badly drawn that the Speaker could not understand it. That is what has happened in the course of this debate, and the Under Secretary for War should give up the system of legislation by reference. I ask the hon. Gentleman why is it that in all the operations connected with these Acts in Ireland a desire is evinced to plunder the people of the whole of the lands taken for military purposes, while in England you are prepared to give forty to forty-five years purchase for lands similarly acquired. In Ireland the state of the law is that you provide two removable magistrates to assess the price of the land to be taken from the tenants. You might as well, if a railway company is to take land in England, appoint two railway porters at random to fix the price of the land compulsorily taken for the railway. Why should we tolerate the extension of this system in Ireland? Not long ago four square miles were taken from the Curragh of Kildare. That was an act of public plunder, and the people who had had for centuries the rights of grazing on the Curragh were not paid a single shilling of compensation. I suppose that can be defended on the grounds of public policy! The meanness of the procedure was also exhibited in the case of the compulsory acquisition of one of the most beautiful spots in Wicklow, belonging to Mr. Stuart Moore. I asked twenty questions in this House on the subject before Mr. Moore, although he is a Unionist, could get the compensation to which he was entitled. Then there was the case of Bere Island, taken by the

Admiralty. The right of the tenants to compensation was to be decided by two removable magistrates, but it was actually subsequently laid down in a superior court that the Government were wrong in that particular procedure, although no costs were given against the Crown. Is it to be supposed that we in Ireland should agree to pass a measure of this kind, which has a different operation in Ireland from what it has in this country? One of the principal clauses of the Act was drawn in consequence of an Irish decision. I would like to ask the hon. Gentleman, does he understand Clause 6?

MR. WYNDHAM: Yes.

MR. T. M. HEALY: The hon. Gentleman does understand it! Well, I should like to read it to the House—

"Notwithstanding anything in Section 2 of the Military Lands Act, 1892, the period of three years mentioned in Section 123 of the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act, 1845, shall be calculated from the passing of the Act confirming any Provisional Order under the Military Lands Act, 1892, and not from the passing of the Military Lands Act, 1892."

And the right hon. Gentleman understands that? Well, I congratulate him. To a certain extent I understand it myself, because it was drawn in consequence of a decision upon a point raised in Ireland in respect to the taking of land, but I do not believe that any person, except a specialist like the hon. Gentleman upon this point, could understand that section. One would gather from the Bill that it does not apply to Ireland, because it begins by saying, "In the application to Scotland the following provision shall have effect." There is not a word about Ireland. It deals entirely with Volunteers, and as there are no Volunteers in Ireland one would naturally assume that it did not apply to Ireland. But the proposition I would make is this. Give us back trial by jury when you take our land for military purposes. We do not want our lands to be taken at all, but if you do take them do not take them at twenty years purchase as you have done in the past, take them at thirty-five years purchase. Let us have the benefit of English arbitration with its 10 per cent. Give us back the old right we had ten years ago, when land was taken under the Lands Clauses Act—the power to traverse before a jury. I notice that whenever the Lands Clauses Act is referred to in this case it is the English Lands Clauses Act and not the Irish Lands Clauses Act at all. Is it a fact that you are not going to take three square miles of land at Glenbeigh such as you stated you would take from the county council because, if it is, why do you not write a letter to the county council saying that the land is no longer necessary, and ease the minds of these poor people who are expecting to be evicted? Have you done so? It was not done up to Saturday. You have not had the courtesy to do that. No doubt, in this House, Ministers can be courteous when they think their whole time will be taken up; but go down to Glenbeigh when they are beginning gun practice and laying their big guns—there we get scant courtesy. No human being is allowed to show his nose in the whole of that magnificent glen, which has been taken from us. The offers made upon which you take the land of Ireland do not show the consideration which you show in England. You select any part of the country which pleases you; you do not care a button for the people or their struggling sons, or whether it is a pleasure ground like the Curragh, which you took. If it pleases you, you take it. I can quite understand that if you occasionally purchased as much as a pocket-handkerchief for your troops in Ireland, the objection would not be so great; but you do not. The whole of your military system is supplied from this country; of the £50,000,000 you have spent for South Africa, not a farthing has been spent in Ireland; you have not bought so much as a biscuit. Then why should you buy Irish land so cheap? Give us back our trial by jury. Give us the privilege which the Chancellor of the Exchequer himself enjoyed, of selling land at thirty-five years purchase. We shall move to this Bill Amendments restoring the procedure of the Lands Clauses Act, and endeavour to give the people of Ireland some of the protection which it is desired to give. It is of no consequence to us what Government is in power in Ireland. If Ireland was invaded by the Chinese or the Turks it could not be governed in a worse manner than it is by the system which you have forced upon us, and which has been a curse to us from the first day you landed on our shores.

MR. JASPER MORE (Shropshire, Ludlow) said that the owners of the land at Kilworth, taken for military purposes,

were perfectly satisfied with the price paid by the Government.

SIR JAMES JOICEY (Durham, Chester-le-Street) confessed his inability to fully comprehend all the clauses of the Bill, but to the object of it he gave his general support. The company with which he was associated had always taken a very great interest in the Volunteer movement, and they had a great many in their employ who were Volunteers, and they found that owing to the habits of discipline which they acquired they made the best workmen. It was a scandal that the burden of supporting such a magnificent institution should be allowed to fall upon individuals, and he was not satisfied with the Bill as it stood, and it was possible that he would support some of the Amendments which would be moved in the course of the Committee stage, as he was somewhat alarmed at the idea of the local authorities having the power to take any land they might consider suitable for rifle ranges. There was a considerable element of danger in rifle ranges, and he thought some safeguards ought to be introduced in the Bill to insure that any land that might be taken for rifle ranges would be taken in such places as would reduce the element of danger to the public as much as possible.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 186; Noes, 47. (Division List No. 230.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.
Allsopp, Hon. George
Asquith, Rt Hn. Herbert Henry
Atkinson, Right Hon. John
Baillie, James E. B. (Inverness
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds)
Banbury, Frederick George
Barnes, Frederic Gorell
Barry, Rt Hn A H Smith-(Hunts
Bartley, George C. T.
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bethell, Commander
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bill, Charles
Billson, Alfred
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Bonsor, Henry Cosmo Orme
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn)
Brassey, Albert
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Hertford, East)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Bir.)
Chamberlain, J. A. (Worc'r)
Channing, Francis Allston
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Coddington, Sir William
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cooke, C. W. Radcliffe (Heref'd
Cornwallis, Fiennes Stanley W.
Cox, Irwin Edw. Bainbridge
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, H. Shepherd (Bolton)
Curzon, Viscount
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Donkin, Richard Sim
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Hart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Evans, Sir Francis H. (South'ton
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitz Wygram, General Sir F.
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Ernest
Garfit, William
Giles, Charles Tyrrell
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir J. Eldon
Goschen, George J. (Sussex)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gunter, Colonel
Hamilton, Rt. Hn. Lord George
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hayne, Rt. Hon. C. Seale-
Hedderwick, Thomas Chas. H.
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, R. Trotter
Holland, William Henry
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Houldsworth, Sir William H.
Howell, William Tudor
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jones, David Brynmor (Sw'ns'a
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
Lafone, Alfred
Lawrence, Sir E. Durning-(Corn
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks.)
Lecky, Rt. Hon. Wm. Edw. H.
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewelyn, Sir Dillwyn-(Swans'a
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lopes, Henry Yarde Buller
Lowe, Francis William
Lowles, John
Lowther, Rt. Hon. J. (Kent)
Lucas-Shadwell, William
Macartney, W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
Maclure, Sir John William
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Ewan, William
M'Iver, Sir L. (Edinburgh, W.
Malcolm, Ian
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Mellor, Colonel (Lancashire)
Mendl, Sigismunde Ferdinand
Middlemore, J. Throgmorton
Monckton, Edward Philip
Monk, Charles James
Montagu, Sir Samuel (Whitec'l)
More, R. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, Hn. Fred. (Monm'thsh
Morrison, James A. (Wilts, S.
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford)
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Oldroyd, Mark
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Sir C. M. (Durham)
Pease, Herbert P. (Darlington
Philipps, John Wynford
Phillpotts, Captain Arthur
Pilkington, R. (Lancs. Newton)
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plunkett, Rt. Hon. H. Curzon
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Remnant, James Farquharson
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridley, Rt. Hn. Sir Matthew W.
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. C. Thomson

Mr. Jasper More.

Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Russell, T. W. (Tyrone)
Samuel, H. S. (Limehouse)
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. T. Myles
Savory, Sir Joseph
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer, Ernest
Stanley, Sir Henry M. (Lambeth
Steadman, William Charles
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strachey, Edward
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Uni.
Tennant, Harold John
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Vincent, Col. Sir C E H (Sheffield
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds S.)
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E. (Kent)
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E (Taunt'n
Welby, Sir C. G. E. (Notts.)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-under-L.
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Joseph P. (Birm.)
Willoughy de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wodehouse, Rt Hon E. R. (Bath
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, George
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Allison, Robert Andrew
Austin, M. (Limerick, W.)
Blake, Edward
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert (Durham)
Clark, Dr. G. B.
Crombie, John William
Doogan, P. C.
Fenwick, Charles
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hammond, John (Carlow)
Healy, Maurice (Cork)
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
Lawson, Sir W. (Cumberland)
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Macaleese, Daniel
MacDonnell, Dr. M. A. (Qn's C.
M'Dermott, Patrick
M'Ghee, Richard
M'Leod, John
Maddison, Fred.
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Power, Patrick Joseph
Reid, Sir Robert Threshie
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick, B.)
Spicer, Albert
Stanhope, Hon. Philip J.
Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)
Sullivan, T. D. (Donegal, W.)
Wedderburn, Sir William
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Charles Henry (Hull)
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. T. M. Healy and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.

Main Question put, and agreed to. Bill read a second time, and committed for To-morrow.

VOLUNTEERS BILL [Lords.]

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER, Cumberland, Penrith, in the Chair.]

Clause 1 :—

CAPTAIN SINCLAIR (Forfarshire), said that upon the Amendment which was down on the Paper in his name it was not necessary to reiterate the arguments that were adduced against the Bill on the Second Reading. He had hoped that the hon. Gentleman would have seen his way not to have proceeded with this Bill at all this session. He had no desire to impede any measure which could be shown to be useful to the Volunteer or military forces of the country, but the change which was proposed in this clause was far greater than any which had on the two previous occasions been suggested, in principle if not in words. On both those occasions the matter had been considered and the proposal was not pressed. Upon the present occasion the suggestion was that the same words should be used in the case of the Volunteer Act as were used in the Militia and the Reserve Forces Acts which regulate the calling out of those forces. But the Volunteer force was upon an entirely different footing. The Volunteers were entirely for home defence, and the Militia and Army Reserve, whose duty it was to supplement and strengthen the first line of defence of the country, could not be considered in any way to be in the same category as the Volunteers. The object of the clause was to apply the words which were used in the Acts governing those forces to the use of the Volunteer Act. The words "actual or apprehended invasion" covered every possible emergency for which it might be necessary to call out the Volunteers, at least there was no evidence to the contrary. There was evidence that the words were considered from that point of view when the Volunteer Act of 1863 was brought in, and evidence had been adduced in the debate upon the National Defence Act of 1888, and also in the discussion which took place in 1895, in the direction of showing that after full consideration it was decided and determined that those

words which it was now proposed to change were the most appropriate words for the Volunteer Act, and therefore should never be changed. The first attempt to alter the position of the Volunteer force in recent years was in the National Defence Bill of 1888. That contained a clause which practically applied to the Volunteer force the Militia Act. Any one referring to the discussion upon the measure would find that the wishes of the Government then were precisely the same as they were now—namely, to apply the Militia Act to the Volunteers. The proposals received considerable discussion in this House, and exception to those words was taken by the late Sir E. Hamlin, who pointed out that there was no utility in suggesting that there might be other circumstances in which the Volunteers might be required, because those were not circumstances which were applicable to the Volunteers, though they might be to the Militia and Army Reserve forces. It was necessary to recollect that the Volunteers were for home defence, and it was only for that purpose that that force was to be regarded. He pointed out the great danger which might arise as to the efficiency, strength and popularity of the Volunteers if without very deliberate and careful consideration the burden of liability upon them was increased. It could not be too strongly emphasised that the Volunteer force depended for its strength upon its popularity, consisting as it did of civilians who had to depend for their living upon their daily work, and an irreparable injury might be done to the force if the great burden of the Militia service was laid upon them. The result of the discussion in 1888 was that the proposal was dropped because it received so little encouragement in this House. The next occasion on which this matter came before the House was in connection with the Bill of 1895. That Bill was one of the consequences of the Committee to which the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary for War alluded on the Second Reading of this Bill. The Committee sat in 1894, under the presidency of the Financial Secretary of the War Office of the late Government, and considered a number of matters in connection with the Volunteers. To make a long story short, just as the Government of 1888 refused to proceed in the direction contemplated by this Bill, so did the Government of 1895, even after consideration of the subject by the Committee which sat in the previous year. There was every evidence to show that the Government of that day and the Financial Secretary had considered what steps they should take, and how far they should go in regard to laying further liabilities on the Volunteer force. On that subject the then Under Secretary for War said—

> "The Secretary of State, after consulting his advisers, especially those responsible for the administration of the reserve forces, came to the conclusion that it would be inexpedient to render the Volunteers liable to be called upon except in the most urgent circumstances."

He went on to say that it appeared very important to the Government that they should preserve the voluntary character of the Volunteer force, and that the conditions under which they should be required to render military service should be restricted. The Government of 1895 proposed that the Secretary of State for War should be empowered to accept service on the part of individuals or any part of a corps "in case of imminent national danger or emergency." That was the extent to which they were prepared to go. On that occasion the Liberal Government received the support of more than one distinguished Volunteer officer on the other side of the House. The hon. Member for Lewes cordially supported his right hon. friend the Financial Secretary in the action that the Government then took in this most important matter, and the hon. Member for Hereford, who took part in the debate, heartily endorsed the policy of the Government in proceeding cautiously and tentatively in regard to the laying of further liabilities on the Volunteers. He did not know what might be the opinion of those hon. Gentlemen at the present time. He was perfectly certain there would be very little difficulty on either side in proceeding to the consideration of any careful scheme that might render the Volunteer service more efficient, but he thought it was greatly to be regretted, at this time of the session, that this proposal should be brought forward, especially when they remembered that it was a proposal which had not been definitely made in terms before, and the tendency of which had been rejected, not by one, but by two Governments. He hoped that even now it might seem to the Government un-

desirable to proceed with this particular measure. What he wanted to point out on this occasion was that in a matter dealing with the Volunteer force—changing its whole position and status, and increasing the liability to service—in his humble judgment the Bill was not lightened by the dropping of the latter part. It was quite natural that the Government should decide to drop that part, considering the welcome it received last week The first clause was a proposal to increase the obligations of the Volunteer force. If that were wise, he was sure that the Committee on a future occasion would be quite ready to consider it; but it seemed to him, seeing that proposals having a similar tendency had been rejected before, undesirable on this occasion that they should proceed any further with this measure. He moved to leave out Clause 1.

Question proposed, "That Clause 1 stand part of the Bill."

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: For my own part I can say, as one who has been connected for many years with the Volunteers, and as representing my own regiment, that I think this change suggested by the Government is absolutely necessary in the interests of the country. The Volunteer Act of 1863 only provided for the calling out of the Volunteers in case of actual invasion. The hon. and gallant Gentleman who moved the rejection of the clause has served for a considerable period in the Army, and must know that if the Government delay calling out the Volunteers—230,000 men—to repel invasion until a hostile fleet is actually off the coast, or the enemy has actually set foot on our shores, it will be too late to render any effective service; and it has been long felt not only by the Volunteers and their commanding officers, but by the great mass of the force, that they will be prevented from giving effective service to the country, which it is their desire to give, not only in the event of the country being in grave difficulty, but especially in the event of invasion, if their services are not utilised until actual invasion has occurred. The hon. Gentleman opposite is correct in a certain part of the historical retrospect which he gave. It is true that Mr. Stanhope was much impressed with the necessity for something being done, and a Bill was brought forward in the session of 1888. There was a certain amount of opposition. There was a great deal of business remaining undischarged, and in the circumstances it seemed desirable that the Bill should be dropped, but there was no serious opposition to it on the part of the great mass of the Volunteer force. I have the clearest recollection of what took place. In 1894 the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition, then Secretary of State for War, assented to the appointment of a Select Committee to inquire into the working of the Volunteer Acts and the legal condition and status of Volunteers serving under those Acts. The Financial Secretary of the War Office, the Member for Hanley, was chairman of that Committee. The recommendation of the Committee upon this particular matter was in consonance with the unanimous agreement as to the great desirability of these words being altered. For my own part, I think if the Government is to blame it is to blame for not introducing a measure of this sort before. I regret that Mr. Stanhope did not press the measure forward. It is no use introducing these measures unless the Government intends to use its majority to give effect to them. I earnestly hope that my hon. friend will not be deterred by any sign of opposition, but will persevere with this measure. I have got up to give the views of the Volunteers. The hon. Gentleman opposite affected to speak for the Volunteers It is desirable that those who speak for the Volunteers should qualify themselves by going through the service. My hon. friend who proposed the elimination of the clause said he greatly feared it would have a prejudicial effect on the recruiting for the Volunteer force. He will admit, I think, that I am very largely interested in the welfare of the force, and that it is not at all likely I should advocate a change which would entail an extra burden on those with whom I am so closely associated. I can assure you that the Volunteers thoroughly understand the meaning of the section, and the great mass of them—although among such a body as 230,000 men some may fear it will impose increased liability upon them—think the proposed change absolutely necessary in the interests of national defence. That being so, I earnestly hope that the Government having seen fit to introduce this measure, will place it this year upon the Statute-book.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I cannot speak, as my hon. friend does, in the name of all the Volunteers. Let us hope that he will not regard with superior contempt, which he does not always display, those who happen to differ from him. He spoke with something like contempt of hon. Members in some parts of this House who ventured to contest his doctrine as to what the Volunteers throughout the country desire. We all know that my hon. and gallant friend is a distinguished Volunteer, but I know many cases where Volunteers differ in opinion, and where he is in a minority, On this occasion I cannot accept his pontifical assertion as absolutely conclusive in the matter. This is a clause we all thought, and I in the innocence of my heart thought, was a comparatively harmless clause; but I have since looked a little more closely into the matter, and I find that although on the first blush it may seem to be very much the same thing to talk of "actual or apprehended invasion of any part of the United Kingdom" and "imminent national danger or great emergency," yet there has been found in these words a difference which deserves to be maintained. The hon. Gentleman referred to the speech made in the discussion in 1887 by the late Sir Edward Hamley. He was a distinguished soldier, and one of the greatest authorities on military questions from the constitutional point of view we have had in my time in the House, and he was emphatically of opinion that it would be almost fatal to the character of the Volunteer force if you were to alter these words. The Volunteer force is purely raised and maintained for domestic defence.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: There are 11,000 at the front.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Not as Volunteers. They have entered into a new engagement. There is not a single Volunteer serving out of the country, and such a thing has never been contemplated, and you can see the confusion we would get into if you did not keep up a distinction between the forces. What would be the distinction between the Militia and the Volunteers if you abolished the present distinction? Here I am reminded of a pamphlet or paper which I read at the time. It was called, "A Discussion held by a Body of Volunteer Officers," whom I think my hon. and gallant friend will consider of some authority. I do not think the Queen's Edinburgh Volunteers a very bad corps among all the distinguished corps in the Volunteer service, and I do not think that the present Lord Justice Clerk, Lord Kingsburgh, formerly Mr. Macdonald, is a mean authority on the subject. At a discussion in connection with the East of Scotland Tactical Society on the Report of the Committee to which reference has been made, they scouted the proposal to substitute a vague term for an exact term. Colonel J. B. Sutherland said—

"Under these conditions, and with the proposed altered phraseology, the Volunteer forces might conceivably be called upon to perform garrison duties at home when there was no prospect of either actual or apprehended invasion. I venture to think that this is no part of the duties of the Volunteer force. If garrison duties are to be performed in order to relieve the Regular forces, these duties should be performed by the Militia, and if the Militia is not strong enough for the purpose, the authorities have the remedy in their own hands by enforcing compulsory service in the Militia."

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: May I ask the date of that Report?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: It was 1895. This distinction that the Volunteers are not to be called upon for actual military service except under the threat of immediate invasion is not a mere fancy, not a mere phantasmal case to make a distinction between one and another. It rests upon this—What would happen if there was an actual or immediately impending invasion? All the business of the country would come to a standstill, and those men who are Volunteers would be free, without loss of professional or commercial position, to take part in the discharge of their duties. At this same symposium which I have quoted, Captain Hunter said—

"The main difficulty of the question lies in this double individuality which each Volunteer possesses. A regular soldier, no matter what his rank, has one individuality and one only; and it is in his military capacity that he earns his livelihood. I, on the other hand, am two distinct and separate individuals; I am Mr. Hunter, chartered accountant, and I am also Captain Hunter, but Mr. Hunter is of vastly greater importance to me than Captain Hunter is. It is in my civil capacity that I earn my livelihood, and I have only engaged to undertake military service when, by 'actual or apprehended invasion' the country shall have been reduced to such a state that it will be impossible for me to carry on my profession. If the Com-

mittee's proposals are carried out, I shall find myself liable to military service under conditions where there is nothing to prevent me from carrying on my civil occupation."

That is a view which will no doubt occur to many Volunteers. That is the ground on which it is urged that a change of this sort, although my hon. and gallant friend the Member for Central Sheffield does not believe it, may prejudicially affect the recruiting for the Volunteers. Here are the words used by one of the greatest authorities on the subject—

"Brigadier-General Macdonald, C.B., in closing the discussion, said that he was strongly of opinion that the liability for service, as at present provided for, was quite sufficient, and that the proposal to alter the words 'actual or apprehended invasion' to 'imminent national danger or great emergency,' was in all respects an unwise one. If the words suggested were inserted there might be rashness on the part of military authorities at any time in calling out the Volunteers. His feeling arose mainly from this, that they were substituting for phrases which had certain and definite meanings, words which had uncertain and indefinite meanings. 'Imminent national danger' and 'grave emergency' were phrases of very uncertain import, under which the Volunteers might be called upon to do duties differing very materially from those contemplated under the constitution of the force."

He went on to say that it might prejudicially affect the position of the force. I do not think these are opinions of Volunteers deserving to be cast aside, even on the high authority of my hon. and gallant friend. When I heard him lay down the law in so peremptory a manner I thought that the sooner I addressed the Committee the better. One point which the hon. Gentleman urged in commending this clause to the House the other day on the Second Reading was that we got rid of the awkward and inconvenient necessity for a proclamation. But a proclamation is required for calling out the Reserves or embodying the Militia; so that one more will not matter. I do not think there is much force in that. I would urge on the Committee not to make the change now—a change which has been repudiated by the House on more than one occasion, which has been condemned by high authorities, although, of course, not so high as my hon. and gallant friend—a change of which we cannot at present quite fathom and measure the ultimate effect. What is the necessity for the Bill?

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: The Bill has been recommended by the Committee ppointed by the late Government.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: But who were the Committee?

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: Your own Financial Secretary was the chairman of it.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: My hon. friend the Member for Hanley, who was Chairman of the Committee, was only the bottle-holder to the hon. and gallant Gentleman, who inspired it with energy and enthusiasm, and at whose suggestion it was appointed. He deserves all the credit, and I hope he will receive none of the blame, for what it has done. The words which it is proposed to alter maintain the old character of the Volunteer force, on which all the legislation with regard to them is founded, and they ought not to be altered even under the influence of the captivating arguments of the hon. and gallant Gentleman opposite.

MR. WYNDHAM: I confess that I have listened to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition with amazement. On Wednesday last the right hon. Gentleman welcomed this proposal amid unanimous cheers from all parts of the House.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: "Welcomed" is a strong word. I was directing my fire against another proposal, and I said of this one some words to the effect that it was comparatively acceptable. But I have since looked into the Bill.

MR. WYNDHAM: The right hon. Gentleman's acceptance was so warm that I, at all events, mistook it for welcome. The right hon. Gentleman has since come upon a debate of a somewhat academic character which took place in 1895, and he now presents his own Financial Secretary, not as chairman of the Committee on this subject, but as bottle-holder to the hon. Member for Central Sheffield. That may be enough excuse for the right hon. Gentleman's right-about turn, but the Government, who are responsible for this Bill, which they believe to be of the greatest importance to Volunteers, and to be generally welcomed by them, will do their best to see it passed this session. All are agreed that the Volunteers exist to repel invasion. The only point is whether Her Majesty is bound to declare to the whole world by proclamation that she appre-

hends invasion, at a time when diplomacy is at its last gasp. What I said the other day—and I am bound to repeat my argument—was that when a foreign ambassador accredited to this Court was in daily and hourly conference with our own Foreign Secretary, was not the time Her Majesty should be made to proclaim with her own mouth that she apprehends invasion. Of course it will not be done. Everybody knows that no Government would issue that proclamation, which is so different from other proclamations, precisely because it contains these words, which would be so inopportune. That is why we propose that the terms should be amended. If that be true—and I think it was generally said the other day—it follows that no step could be taken to put the Volunteers into a position to repel invasion until invasion had taken place. I say again, as I said on Wednesday last, that no War Office, after any amount of re-organisation, could turn the Volunteers into a field Army, with transport and supplies, in the course of twenty-four or forty-eight hours. It could not be done in less than two or three weeks. If this change should be refused, then all the money spent on the Volunteers is wasted, and the Volunteers are being made fools of. We have heard it said that the military authorities will call out the Volunteers rashly. The military authorities will not call them out at all unless it is the policy of the Government. To call them out would cost for the first month £2,500,000 in pay and allowances alone, while each ensuing month would cost £1,570,000. If the cost of transport and provisions and equipment is added, the first month would cost £4,000,000. I have no fear that any Government will rashly authorise that expenditure. I believe that if this alteration is made other Governments will follow in the steps of all Governments who have presided over the destinies of this country, and will not incur that charge until it is absolutely necessary.

MR. RADCLIFFE COOKE (Hereford): I agree to some extent that this Bill is a useful measure, but the importance of it has been exaggerated. I am sure if we were in the peculiar position of being on the verge of invasion it would make very little difference whether the Volunteers were called out in consequence of "imminent national danger" or "apprehended invasion." The nation would be perfectly well aware of the reason why they were called out. I do not, myself, think very much of the argument that the character of the Volunteer force would be changed if the Bill passed into law. As a matter of fact the force has changed considerably during the last few years. When it was first established the greater part of the force were in the position described by Captain Hunter in the speech which was quoted by the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition; but within the last few years a great number of the men who have joined the force really belong to the Militia. They have joined the Volunteer force because it is the easier force—because more amusement can be obtained out of it, and they are taken away from their work less. What is really wanted is not so much a measure of this kind—although I shall vote for it—as such a training of the whole Volunteer force that when a national emergency does arise those who volunteer for that force will be of immediate use. The first object of the War Office ought to be to furnish us with a Volunteer force that is thoroughly effective, so that when men volunteer for active service they may be of use at once. If some system of that kind is adopted——

*THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order! That does not seem to be relevant to the clause under discussion.

MR. RADCLIFFE COOKE: What I meant to imply was that in a case of national emergency the Government of the day would have at hand, voluntarily offering themselves for the Volunteer force, the class of men whom they would require to meet that particular emergency. I shall vote for this measure, because I think to some extent it may be useful, but I should not vote for it if I thought the intention of the Government was to mislead the people by making them suppose that this measure would to any large extent render the Volunteer force more effective than at present, or that by it something was done really to organise the military forces of the Empire.

*MR. C. P. SCOTT (Lancashire, Leigh): I think it is important clearly to understand from the Government what is intended to be the practical effect of the change of words here suggested. I

know quite well that no intention can bind the successors of, or even the present Government, but we ought to be told clearly what the practical effect will be of changing these well-known definite words for other words less definite. The Under Secretary for War gives us to understand that no change was intended, that the Volunteers would be called out under the new form as under the old form, only when the Government apprehended invasion, and that the Government did not wish to put the fact in a Proclamation for fear it should interfere with the course of diplomacy and precipitate that which they wished to avoid. If it were clearly understood that that was the intention of the Government it would make a great difference; and I hope the Under Secretary will be able to assure us on that point.

MR. WYNDHAM: I have already made two speeches in which I endeavoured to convey that idea, and I doubt whether I should be more successful if I made a third.

*MR. C. P. SCOTT: I read the Second Reading speech of the hon. Gentleman very carefully, but I do not think he made it so clear as he has now done. If that is the case, and that intention is acted upon, it will make the clause practically innocuous and also inoperative. But the House had an apprehension that that was not the whole object of the Government. It is obvious that within the last few months the country has passed through circumstances which might fairly be called "a great emergency." I think after the battle of Colenso we were certainly in a position which might be so described, and the Government would have been perfectly within their rights — if the law had been as they are now proposing to make it—in calling out the Volunteers.

MR. WYNDHAM was understood to dissent.

*MR. C. P. SCOTT: The hon. Gentleman shakes his head. That means, I suppose, that the Government would not have done it. I am glad of that, but they would have been at perfect liberty to have done so. The effect of this change will be that instead of depending on the definite words of the Act we shall depend upon the good will of the Government, which is somewhat changeable, and the Volunteers themselves will never know exactly what are the obligations they undertake. If the change is applied in the manner suggested, I do not think it will make much difference; but if at any time the Government were in a tight place and called on the Volunteers —it would be then, after the Volunteers and the employers of Volunteers had had experience of the new condition under which these men would be called out for service—that the force must suffer in popularity, and this change be found to be a very grave one.

*MR. WYLIE (Dumbartonshire): As an old Scottish Volunteer, and still in close touch with the force, and with some of the most eminent and practical commanding officers, I wish to say a few words in support of this clause, the object of which is to render the volunteers more promptly available as an important portion of the great defensive forces of our country in any time of imminent national danger or great emergency, even if that emergency or danger does not amount to actual or apprehended invasion. I believe that recent events have proved the desirability of this measure. It is argued that the introduction of such a Bill is not opportune, and that if brought forward at all it should be in conjunction with some more important measure. But I think it is a most opportune, useful, and necessary measure, and one which will form a very valuable instalment of any complete scheme of reorganisation and reform, which I hope will be undertaken immediately after the present war, and with the light of the experience which that war has afforded us. Seeing that increased duties and responsibilities are to be placed on the Volunteers, it is natural that they and their friends should be anxious to know what increased encouragement and support the Government propose to give them. My opinion is that if the Government support the Volunteers, as we hope they will do, not only would the efficiency of the force be increased, but its numbers would be doubled, so that there might easily be a force of half a million ready to be promptly availed of in case of imminent national danger or great emergency, a large portion of whom would volunteer to serve in any part of the world, still leaving in this country for the legitimate purposes of home defence a very much larger number of Volunteers

than are at present in existence. I give my cordial support to the clause now before the Committee.

MR. MADDISON (Sheffield, Brightside): I shall certainly support the omission of the clause. When the Under Secretary for War stated a few months ago the effect of the alteration of these words upon the course of any delicate diplomacy which might be in progress, I admit he struck a note which, if it had been a sound one, would have compelled me to vote against my hon. and gallant friend. The whole purport of the hon. Gentleman's remarks was that the effect of the alteration of these words would be to prevent something being regarded by a foreign Power as an act of war. I am quite unable to see that the difference in these words could possibly have that effect. If we were engaged in such delicate diplomacy I should be the last to turn that diplomacy into provocation; we have had quite enough of that. But what would be the actual effect? Under the present law, if the Volunteers were called out, a foreign Power would know it was because of an actual or apprehended invasion of some part of the United Kingdom. And if these words were deleted, and for them were substituted the words, "imminent national danger or great emergency," what difference could it possibly have upon the course of diplomatic negotiations with any foreign Power? Does the hon. Member mean to tell the Committee that trained diplomatists would be so ignorant of the state of affairs that it would make the slightest difference to them what the words were which formed the basis on which the Volunteers were called out, so long as the words indicated national danger? We who are not regarded as being at all advocates of militarism have always differentiated between a force which, as the law stands, is a purely home defence force, a body of citizen soldiers, and the regular Army; and I confess that, much as I detest war, and militarism generally, anything in reason to make that voluntary arm more effective would have my support.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: Then you ought to vote for this clause.

MR. MADDISON: The hon. and gallant Gentleman's dogmatism is so common that it really has no market price now. The Under Secretary for War needs to be very cautious of the hon. and gallant Member for Central Sheffield, because he represents the jingo section of the Volunteers of this country. That section is a very small portion of that great force; there are very few who have such great ambitions. The majority are mere citizens, and do not want to be anything else; they have no desire to become soldiers in all but name, they simply want to belong to a force whose one call upon them is the defence of their native land. I say, deliberately, that if the Under Secretary of State for War wants really to encourage volunteering, instead of tampering with the force, he should make it more and more clear that the members belong to a home defence force and that alone. The hon. and gallant Gentleman shakes his head; he, at any rate, is candid. But I am speaking of the great mass of the rank and file, the poor men—the Volunteers with wives and families—who are quite content to serve their country, and believe they are serving their country, although not treading a foreign strand, by making themselves effective, so that should occasion arise they may be prepared to defend their native land against invasion. But you do not even say "great national emergency." What do you mean by "great emergency"? I can conceive a state of affairs in which you might have an emergency which was not an emergency from outside at all, and I say deliberately, I will be no party to giving to a Minister, when Parliament is not sitting, the great power here proposed, and the duty of interpreting these words, seeing that the result might be of such serious moment to the working classes of this country. There is no need for this Bill so far as the effectiveness of the Volunteers is concerned. We who vote against this clause are not voting in any way against making the Volunteer force effective; we are voting to maintain the original and true character of the force, and to prevent it being placed in the hands of any foolish or possibly unscrupulous Minister, who might use it for a purpose foreign to that for which it was formed.

MR. WYNDHAM: May I correct a misapprehension under which the hon. Member has spoken? By the law of the

land we cannot move Volunteers out of the country at all.

MR. MADDISON: I did not say otherwise. I can assure the hon. Gentleman I had no such thought in my mind.

MR. WYNDHAM: Then the hon. Member seemed to think that some great emergency of a social character might arise. We cannot use a Volunteer against the civil power.

COLONEL PILKINGTON: I should like to congratulate my hon. friend the Under Secretary——

Attention called to the fact that forty Members were not present. House counted, and forty Members being found present,

*COLONEL PILKINGTON: I should very much like to say how much I congratulate the Government and my hon. friend the Under Secretary for War on the introduction of this Bill. It seems to me that Clause 1 is a clause which makes a valuable change which will be welcomed by the Volunteers. This is the opinion not only of Volunteer officers, but also of many men of business throughout the country who are not connected with Volunteers at all. They feel that these words are wanted in order to improve the scope of the Bill. Now, Sir, with regard to the new words, it seems to me that they are very much better than the old words, and may cover the old words, and as for supposing that they would be wrongly used by the Government, I think that any such remark or objection, when looked into carefully, entirely falls to the ground. It is not the War Office, but the Government of the day, and the Government of the day is the Cabinet which represents the majority of the House of Commons, and is it likely any Cabinet or Government that has behind it the House of Commons would be so foolish or rash as to do anything which in any way would be dangerous? What we find so generally in this kind of thing is that the Government, instead of being precipitate and rash, and instead of acting with great speed, the danger is that they generally act too slowly. With regard to almost all the military movements of whatever kind which have taken place for many years past, we have moved with very great care and very great wisdom, and very often with too much hesitation. I do not believe that there is any danger in the words proposed. On the contrary, I believe there is very great safety in them. In my opinion they have been long wanted, and I believe that no business man, Volunteer or otherwise, would object to the insertion of these words. I have for many years past believed that in Volunteer circles it was the opinion that some such words should be inserted. It has been urged that the insertion of such words would be distasteful to the Volunteers, and that they would not increase their number. I do not believe that for a moment. I think this will meet the views of Volunteers in great measure, and they will see something here is done which will make their force much more effective, and I will explain to the House why I think so in a few moments. The South African War must have added 50,000 at least new members to the force. In a regiment I know very well I know that the battalion has increased very much. I think that is a proof that the Volunteers, if they see danger to the country, will immediately rally to the country's cause, and come forward in greater numbers. I will give another instance of the effect on Volunteers. It was at one time said that fourteen days camping of Volunteers would create a great deal of enthusiasm.

*THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order! The hon. Member is travelling beyond the limits of this clause. He must confine himself strictly to this clause.

*COLONEL PILKINGTON: I accept your ruling, Mr. Chairman. I see the old words are "Actual or apprehended invasion." If the Government wait until an actual invasion begins before they call out the Volunteers, I say distinctly—knowing something of the Volunteers, and being a Volunteer officer—I think we should go simply to the shambles. I believe there would be confusion, and we should not know where we were or what we were doing. The foreign forces would be actually on our soil, probably in great numbers, and although it is very likely they would not get very much further because of the Line and Militia, we as a force should be no good at all. That is my opinion, and I will explain why I think so. We now find when we go into

camp that it is only after a week's or a fortnight's drill that different battalions, as it were, begin to feel at home. After a few days or a fortnight we find ourselves far better than we were at the end of the first week. Wherever we are sent, at first we should be all at sea; we should not know the ground or the town. By degrees we should get accustomed to the surroundings, and it would be found then whether we were short of transport or not. In the camp in which I was this year for fourteen days, there were many things wanted. Perhaps the ammunition cart had got no horse, and——

*THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order! I must ask the hon. Member to resume his seat when I rise. The hon. Member is now discussing the general training of Volunteers, which cannot now be raised.

*COLONEL PILKINGTON: I am trying to show that at least a month or six weeks training would be required to ensure some amount of efficiency among the Volunteers. But it does seem to me that it is too much to expect good results if the Volunteers were called out forty-eight hours after the invasion has begun. They could not be an efficient force under those circumstances, and it seems to me that if the War Office and the Government and the country are to rely upon the Volunteers for the home defence force—looking at the great numbers and the great part they fill in the forces—it is absolutely necessary that they should be afforded every opportunity for making themselves efficient, and be put in a position so that they may become acquainted with the position and be furnished with all the requisites and transport equipment, so that if the enemy comes up they may be well prepared to give a good account of themselves. It seems to me that the changes it is proposed to make are in the right direction. They would enable the Government to take time by the forelock and get the Volunteers in that position in which they might have to make a stand eventually. What the Volunteers wish is to be sufficiently efficient to be called out at the proper time and be ready for an invasion if it should come. I hope this change will be made, and that the clause at it stands, without Amendment, will be passed. I trust that the measure will become law this session.

Colonel Pilkington.

MR. CAWLEY (Lancashire, Prestwich) said he was afraid this clause, if passed, would have a very bad effect upon the Volunteers. He had listened to the remarks of several hon. Members, and he preferred the opinion of his hon. friend the Member for the Leigh Division in regard to the rank and file of Volunteers to that of the hon. and gallant Member for Central Sheffield, who was an officer in the Volunteer service. He doubted whether the opinion of the Volunteers was so much in favour of the measure as it had been represented to be. For a commanding officer to merely summon the Volunteers before him and ask them whether they liked this change or not was not the correct way to arrive at their real opinions. He thought it was far more likely that the Volunteers would not be in favour of a change like this. A great many Volunteers came from small employers, and he could understand such employers not liking their clerks to be liable to be called out except in case of apprehended invasion. It seemed to him that this clause was placing a very great power in the hands of the particular Minister at any particular time. There was no doubt that the phrase "imminent national danger or great emergency" allowed a great deal of latitude, and it might be interpreted very differently by different Ministers at different times. On the other hand, the terms on which the Volunteers were elected at the present time were not at all ambiguous, for they all knew that they were only going to be called upon for active service in case their country was invaded. When the ordinary Volunteer came to read the terms of this clause which it was proposed to substitute, an ambiguity would be found about it which was not at all desirable, and which he thought would prevent a great many men enlisting in the service. Perhaps at the present moment this provision would not deter any men from joining, but when the war was over, and the people came to pay the bills which they would be called upon to pay, he thought it would discourage people from joining the Volunteers. He had not had the practical experience of the hon. and gallant Member for Central Sheffield, although he had once had the privilege of being a full private, and he might say that his own experience did not coincide with the experience of the hon. and gallant Member

opposite who was a colonel in the Volunteers. He thought this provision was a very undesirable one, and unless the hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill could give them a more practical and satisfactory explanation why this change was wanted he should certainly vote against the clause.

*MR. JOHN WILSON (Falkirk Burghs) believed that this Bill would increase the martial spirit amongst their Volunteers. Personally, when the Bill for the war came to be paid he had no fear of the result, and in case of an apprehended invasion or imminent national danger he believed that a large number of their Volunteers would be found ready to join not only in the defence of their country, but to go anywhere in the interests of their country. What had they found in the case of the invasion of British territory in South Africa? There a horde of undrilled peasants, fifty of whom could not march in line together, but who could shoot straight, had been able to oppose successfully the finest forces in the world. He thought this South African war had shown very forcibly the necessity of having a Volunteer force which would be ready to go anywhere and do anything at the call of duty. He heartily supported this measure, and he sincerely hoped that there would be appointed some person who would have charge of the Volunteer forces, for he should not like to hear of another mistake being made like the unfortunate instance of which the House was already aware.

MR. JOHN BURNS (Battersea): The speech just delivered by the hon. Member does not help the Government very much, because practically what he says is wanted is a condition of things that will enable the Volunteers to be called out, and in his own words, "to go anywhere and do anything."

*MR. JOHN WILSON: I did not say I wanted such a state of things to arise. What I said was that if such a condition of things arose the Volunteers would be found ready and willing to go anywhere and do anything.

MR. JOHN BURNS: But if these men are so anxious to defend their country, they only need to go down to the recruiting sergeant, and then they can share the honour and distinction of going to South Africa by enlisting like the ordinary soldier, who at this moment is so pluckily doing his work. I have been out just now to the Vote Office, and what do I find? I find that we have five Bills, all of which are significant of the spirit of militarism that is being introduced into this country at this particular moment. We have a Bill for the Volunteers, one for the Reserve Forces, one on the Military Manœuvres, the Military Lands Bill, and the Naval Reserve Bill, and every one of these Bills seeks to extend the power which the Government now has for giving more men to the Reserve, and calling them out at the discretion of the Admiralty. These measures give the Government more latitude and discretion in mobilising the Naval Reserves than they have hitherto had. With regard to the Military Lands Bill, we see a military spirit pervading that measure, and military lands are to be placed at the discretion of the War Office, and it is proposed to give commanding officers power to close roads and to do other things. Then we have the Reserve Forces Bill, which gives the War Office similar powers in relation to the Reserve forces. I think the whole of these Bills are symptomatic of an attempt to rush through the House of Commons in the emergency of the war with South Africa a series of measures to convert the Volunteer force into the Militia force or something like a conscript force under conscript conditions. I object to this Volunteers Bill, notwithstanding the fact that the Under Secretary for War has deleted Sub-section (*b*) of Clause 2, and I do so on the ground that if you allow the War Office to determine without confirmation of this House what an imminent national danger or a great emergency is, we shall probably see a further development of what we have quite recently witnessed—namely, the Volunteers being moved forward to the Militia stage, the Militia moved to the Army Reserve stage, the Army Reserves moved forward to the Regular Army, and the Indian Army again brought into Europe, and the Regular Army depleted at home to go abroad. The Volunteers, under the phrase "imminent national danger or great emergency," could be called upon to strengthen the depleted garrisons of the Regular Army, and they could be called

out for purposes which under the present law would not be legal. I protest against that. I object by a side wind or by any other patriotic subterfuge to convert what is a voluntary force into what is a more or less compulsory force at the discretion of the War Office. If this Bill is passed with this phrase, "imminent national danger or great emergency," you will change the character of the Volunteer army, which is at present well understood by the Volunteers, who joined under well-known conditions, and who do not object to be summoned when there is actual or apprehended invasion. You will damage the Volunteers as part of our national defence, and will convert that force into a more or less compulsory force, probably for service abroad. What is a "great emergency"? The Emperor of Germany, a few years ago, made his celebrated "mailed fist" speech. This country seemed to have lost its head over it. They took a great deal too much notice of the German Emperor, and more notice of him on that occasion than I would take of his utterances on any occasion. They called out the Flying Squadron, which was not out as soon as it ought to have been, and not quite as efficient as it ought to have been, considering the money spent on the Navy. It was called out in answer to the "mailed fist" speech of the Emperor. Under the Volunteer Act you could not have construed that speech as an imminent national danger or great emergency. But if this Bill is passed and the German Emperor makes another "mailed fist" speech, you will have the Flying Squadron called out again, supplemented by the hon. and gallant Member for Central Sheffield calling the Queen's Westminsters together and saying, "Here is the German Emperor making another 'mailed fist' speech. Let us under the new Act appeal to the War Office to interpret it as an imminent national danger or great emergency, and then the Act may be put into operation." That is to happen whenever a tinpot European monarch makes a speech which cannot possibly harm England, and who has not a Navy equal to a tenth of our Navy. The whale and the elephant rarely come into collision. Under this Bill gentlemen like the hon. and gallant Member for Central Sheffield will be petitioning the War Office to call out the Volunteers. I do not think this Bill is wanted. What is more, you will let the Volunteers think, by the passing of this Bill, that they are to be subject to the discretion of the War Office. I would not trust much to the discretion of the War Office. They have bungled in South Africa; they make a mess of nearly everything they take in hand, and if they have this Bill they will have power to do with the Volunteers what they did with the whole military arrangements in South Africa. I am not prepared to give a War Office such as ours the discretionary power of calling out the Volunteers when in its opinion a great emergency has arisen. If the War Office had done their duty, the necessity of discussing this Bill would not have arisen at all. If the Army had been in a state of efficiency, as it ought to have been considering the amount of money voted for it, we should not be called upon to discuss this Bill at all. Then we are asked to spoil the Volunteer force—for that is what it means—because the War Office have not acted efficiently. Immediately the Volunteers recognise you are tampering with free voluntary enlistment, and that they are to be put under the discretionary powers of Lord Lansdowne, then the Volunteer army will disappear like butter in the sun. The hon. and gallant Gentleman opposite says that the Volunteers like it. Where is the proof? What Volunteer corps has been brought together and had the terms of this Bill submitted to them? Has a plébiscite been taken of the hon. and gallant Gentleman's own regiment? I have ten times as many of the Queen's Westminsters living in my constituency as the hon. Member has.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: I am willing to meet you in your constituency.

MR. JOHN BURNS: I will not take the trouble to meet the hon. and gallant Gentleman. The Queen's Westminster are efficient Volunteers, and they want to remain Volunteers. They do not want to listen to a lot of prancing patriots, whose idea of the Volunteer force is that every man in England who is not a soldier or a sailor should be a marine. I can assure the hon. and gallant Gentleman that in his zeal to improve the Volunteers as a defensive force he is going the wrong way about it, and that if the Volunteers are placed under the discretion of the War Office, men will refuse

to join, and the Volunteers will suffer in number, in *esprit de corps*, and in efficiency, and they will refuse to be converted from a practically voluntary force into a more or less conscriptive force. It is because this Bill is one of a series of militarizing enactments, which has for its object a conscript Militia, and the making of a free Volunteer Army into a more or less conscriptive force, and because the Volunteers will be sadly damaged in efficiency and numbers, that I protest against it. I come to one of my last points. The political atmosphere just now is charged with everything of a military character. We see hon. and gallant Gentlemen like the Member for Central Sheffield and the members of town councils asking, in a fever of panic, that the police should be armed. They want rifle ranges here, there, and everywhere, and they want the Volunteers converted into a conscriptive force. The militarization of English public life is going on to an extent that would be absolutely unnecessary if the War Office did its work properly, and if the Army and Navy were looked after to the extent they should be. It is because this Bill is one more link in the chain of jingoising England that I protest against it. If the Volunteers in my own constituency are in favour of this Bill, I have received no evidence of it. I do not believe that there is one Volunteer in a thousand who knows of the existence of this measure, or who has considered its terms with his comrades. It is because I believe the Bill is intended to place the Volunteers under the discretion of the War Office, and to enable them to be called up at any time for service both at home and abroad, that I am opposed to it. I oppose it also because I have a greater regard for the Volunteer force than the hon. and gallant Member for Central Sheffield, who has the most unfortunate knack of doing the right thing in the wrong way, and of going about a good thing in a way which ultimately defeats his purpose. I intend challenging a division upon this Bill, which I believe to be unnecessary.

CAPTAIN SINCLAIR: There is one point which does not seem to have been cleared up in the discussion. It is most difficult to get the critics and the advocates of this particular clause together. My hon. friend who has just spoken has referred to the increased liability of service which the Bill undoubtedly imposes on the Volunteer force. The reply made to that is that the Volunteers are patriotic, that the present emergency has shown there is need for their services, and that therefore this Bill is justified. It seems to me that that does not meet the point at all. If it is said that the present emergency has shown that the Volunteers have come forward, that is in itself a condemnation of this measure, because it is perfectly clear that there is now an ample outlet for the patriotic spirit of the Volunteers. My contention is that the present law is sufficient. The Under Secretary for War has referred to the undesirability of issuing a proclamation while negotiations are going on, but does anybody mean to contend that no steps would be taken for the defence of this country or the assertion of its power until we found it necessary to call out the Volunteers? Under the present law, whenever an order is in force for the embodiment of the Militia the Government can accept the services of the Volunteers. At the present time such an order is in force, and the argument that the issue of a proclamation would render the negotiations difficult seems to have no weight whatever. For instance, a proclamation is necessary to call out the Army Reserve, and another to call out the Militia, and in such a case Parliament must meet, if it is not sitting, ten days after the proclamation is issued, and it cannot be supposed that the situation would be rendered more intense by calling out the Volunteers. That is an argument that will not hold water. The second argument of the Under Secretary is that it might be necessary that certain particular garrisons should be manned on certain particular occasions, but surely the present situation has shown there would not be the slightest difficulty in appealing to the patriotic spirit of the Volunteers in order to obtain a sufficient number. I should like to ask the Under Secretary for War if he would state explicitly how far the present powers fall short of the powers proposed in this Bill. This Bill really means a good deal, or it means nothing at all. If it means nothing at all except a mere change of words, then I think it is a great pity that the Government should have put us to the inconvenience of discussing it at this period of

the session. If it means a great deal, the Committee have a right to know all it does mean.

Question put.

The House divided : — Ayes, 127 ; Noes, 62. (Division List No. 231.)

AYES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Banbury, Frederic George
Barnes, Frederick Gorell
Barry, Rt. Hn. A. H. S- (Hunts
Bartley, George C. T.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beckett, Ernest William
Bethell, Commander
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.)
Chamberlain, J. Austen, Worc'r
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Charrington, Spencer
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Fred. Lucas (Lambeth)
Cooke, C. W. Radcliffe (Heref'd)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cornwallis, Fiennes S. W.
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Curzon, Viscount
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Donkin, Richard Sim
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William H.
Fellowes, Hn. Ailwyn Edward
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Ernest
Garfit, William
Giles, Charles Tyrrell
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, George J. (Sussex)
Gourley, Sir Edward Temperley
Greene, H. D. (Shrewsbury)
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robert W.
Hardy, Laurence
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Henderson, Alexander
Holland, William Henry
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Howell, William Tudor
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kimber, Henry
Lafone, Alfred
Lawrence, Sir E Durning- (Corn.
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks.)
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Lockwood, Lt.-Colonel A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowles, John
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas-Shadwell, William
Macdona, John Cumming
Maclure, Sir John William
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinb'rgh, W
Mendl, Sigismund Ferdinand
Middlemore, J. Throgmorton
Monckton, Edward Philip
Monk, Charles James
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morrison, James A. (Wilts. S.)
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)
Muntz, Philip A.
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath
Myers, William Henry
Nicol, Donald Ninian
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Pease, Herbt. Pike (Darlingt'n)
Phillpotts, Captain Arthur
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, R. (Lancs, Newton)
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plunkett, Rt. Hn. Hor. Curzon
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Rentoul, James Alexander
Ridley, Rt. Hn. Sir Matthew W.
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Russell, T. W. (Tyrone)
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos Myles
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stewart, Sir M. J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strachey, Edward
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Wm. E. Murray
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Vincent, Col. Sir C E H (Sheffield
Welby, Lt.-Col. A C E (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Williams, J. Powell- (Birm.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R (Bath)
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, George
Young, Commander (Berks, E.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)
Austin, M. (Limerick, W.)
Billson, Alfred
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Duckworth, James
Evans, Sir Francis H. (South'p'n
Fenwick, Charles
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herb. John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gurdon, Sir William Brampton
Hammond, John (Carlow)
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayne, Rt. Hn. Charles Seale-
Hazell, Walter
Healy, Maurice (Cork)
Healy, Timothy M. (N. Louth)
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
Lawson, Sir W. (Cumberland)
Lewis, John Herbert
Macaleese, Daniel
MacDonnell, Dr. M. A. (Qu'n'sC
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
M'Ghee, Richard
M'Leod, John
Maddison, Fred.
Molloy, Bernard Charles
Morgan, J. L. (Carmarthen)
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, Arthur (Donegal)
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Power, Patrick Joseph
Provand, Andrew Dryburgh
Reid, Sir Robert Threshie
Samuel, J. (Stockton-on-Tees)
Scott, Charles P. (Leigh)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Steadman, William Charles
Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)
Sullivan, T. D. (Donegal, W.)
Tanner, Charles Kearns
Tennant, Harold John
Ure, Alexander
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Captain Sinclair and Mr. Humphreys-Owen.

Captain Sinclair.

Clause 2 :—

CAPTAIN SINCLAIR said that there was nothing definite in the clause. What was urged with regard to this particular provision was that before "actual or apprehended invasion" was the condition of things the Government might call upon Volunteer artillery to garrison certain forts or outlying places, but it was not definitely stated. Therefore he wished, in order to limit the clause, to insert after the word "Volunteer" the words "garrison artillery."

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 10, after 'Volunteer,' to insert 'garrison artillery.'"—(*Captain Sinclair.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'garrison artillery' be there inserted."

MR. JOHN BURNS said before the Under Secretary replied he would like to know by what method these men were to be paid for their services. He put the question for the reason that he did not want a Volunteer to be coerced, or, to use a more expressive phrase, to be bluffed by his colonel into consenting to enlistment——

*THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order! The only question now before the Committee is whether this clause shall be limited to garrison artillery or not.

MR. WYNDHAM: I am afraid that the hon. and gallant Member for Forfar has not quite correctly apprehended what I said the other day, although what he has just said does very nearly cover the whole purpose we contemplate. I think the language I used was that we only contemplated putting garrisons into forts in any estuary leading up to a harbour. Those garrisons, or 99 per cent. of them, are composed of garrison artillery, but there are some other Volunteers required—three or four bicyclists, for instance—to carry on communications between the fort and the rear. Under the scheme of defence as it at present exists, we require about 7,500 men in order to give requisite garrisons to the forts which have been constructed in the Mersey, at Bristol, in the Tyne and the Clyde. These garrisons are almost all composed of garrison artillery, but there must necessarily be some submarine miners and engineers. These garrisons would only go to their posts for drill on frequent occasions, but these things cannot be left to mere chance. The very worst preparation for war is to issue an appeal at the last moment. It is far better that a force of 7,500 men out of a force of 250,000 who are prepared to qualify for these posts should be allowed to register their names in times of peace. I cannot go back from that view. There is no danger of any sort or kind, and the fears with which hon. Members are haunted are so illusory that I find it hard to believe their arguments are serious. It appears to be a deliberate attempt to play at the game, that we are living in the eighteenth century instead of in the dawn of the twentieth. These forts have been built and armed, and these men ask to be allowed to form part of the garrisons, and we ask that they shall be allowed to do so. The proposition is so reasonable that I do not think I am justified in further occupying the time of the House by labouring the point.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: When this matter was before the House on the Second Reading, it was pointed out, and I thought there was a great deal in the proposition made, that instead of extending this to the whole 250,000 men it should be confined to the 7,500 you require. Supposing you are going to man the forts on the Tyne, surely you are not going to Cornwall to get men?

MR. WYNDHAM: The object of the clause is to make it definite instead of allowing it to remain indefinite. We should only take the men from the immediate districts.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Then I have no objection to it myself. I think that is a reasonable suggestion. These men would be in a very much better position to discharge their duties if they knew them some time in advance; but if this is to make it definite I cannot conceive anything more indefinite than the words in the Bill.

MR. WYNDHAM: I propose to move an Amendment which entirely meets that objection.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The Amendment of the hon. Member does meet it to some extent, but I should

have thought some method might be adopted by which the liability should not be put upon the whole force, but on that smaller part consisting of artillery and submarine miners and engineers who are concerned in the matter. I should have thought it better to define it than have it in this indefinite form.

MR. TOMLINSON (Preston): Then, I suppose, when a new fort was built we should have to have a fresh Bill.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Not at all; it could be done by a new rule.

SIR JOHN BRUNNER (Cheshire, Northwich) did not consider the suggestion of the hon. Gentleman was at all unreasonable, and he hoped that the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary would see his way to adopt it. He did not think that this liability should extend to the whole of the Volunteers. This Bill had created a great deal of alarm on account of the extreme ambiguity of its language. He merely mentioned the fact in the hope that the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary would bring forward an Amendment limiting the total number of those who should be asked to offer themselves.

MR. WYNDHAM: The difference between us is not wide, and it appears the difficulty of the situation is to define the intentions of the Government without introducing definitions which might be inconvenient. If I were expected to put all the places in the Bill, I should have to say where all the forts are. If I were asked to put down the number of garrisons, I could say exactly how many men we should require; but a new improvement in the next six months might so alter the conditions that we should have to come here again for more. There is really no danger of any Government being so insane as to try and place all the Volunteers under an obligation of this character. All we ask is that, when money has been spent on the forts, and when there are corps who are to man these forts in time of war in the neighbourhood of these various forts, we should be allowed to select them in time of peace. Unless the Leader of the Opposition thinks that some benefit could be achieved by putting a limit on the number, that is the only way the object could be achieved. But as all these fears are illusory, there is no reason for doing so. I think the House and the country in this matter might well trust this and successive Governments.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: It is not a question of trust or distrust of the Government. It is a question of the disturbing effect this wide suggestion has on the Volunteer force generally. The words are "to accept the offer of any member of a Volunteer corps to subject himself." I do not know whether it would not be better to say, accept the offer of a certain number of the Volunteer forces, and to then accept the Amendment of the hon. Member for Forfarshire. We are both aiming at the same thing.

MR. WYNDHAM: Yes. But the word "any" does not mean "all."

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: It means from certain corps; but I should be very sorry if a Bill in Parliament named the whole of those corps. Nobody has suggested that, and I was only trying to meet the hon. Gentleman by indicating a manner in which the question might be supervised and so safeguarded.

MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN (Montgomeryshire) suggested that as all were agreed upon the principle, instead of taking the discussion on the words now before the House, they should substitute the words "to be called out for coast defence and garrison duty."

MR. BUCHANAN (Aberdeenshire, E.) asked whether the hon. Gentleman could not accept an Amendment to the effect that those called up "shall not exceed 10,000 in all."

MR. WYNDHAM: I could not accept that Amendment. If any hon. Gentleman desires to limit the clause I will try and meet him, but any attempt to try and extract the name of a corps or fort I cannot consent to.

MR. MADDISON did not think there was any Bill in which the intentions of the Government were disclosed so little as in this clause. As there was a perfect agreement as to the principle of the clause,

he suggested that the obligation lay upon the hon. Gentleman to add words that should carry out what the House intended. If the clause could be restricted in the manner suggested by the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition there would be no objection to the clause. But he was not prepared to support the doctrine of a sort of Ministerial infallibility.

MAJOR JAMESON (Clare, W.) agreed with the Amendment. The Under-Secretary had intimated that if the clause was limited in this way it was not business; but garrison artillery were quite different to other branches of Volunteers. He had been ten years in the Regulars and twelve in the Volunteer forces, and if a vote of the Volunteers was taken upon this proposal, which was distinctly contrary to the rules in force, it would be seen that they did not approve of the action of the Government. The artilleryman took a much longer time to train than the infantryman, and if there was anything unbusinesslike in this business, it was the proceedings of the Government. Had the Government reflected for a moment what this proposal meant to the Volunteer forces? What did the Government propose to give in return? Did they propose to exempt them from certain taxes, or sitting on juries, or some other unpleasant duty of a citizen?——

*THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order! The hon. Gentleman is travelling a very long way from the Amendment.

MAJOR JAMESON said that with regard to the artillery, the men should know what obligations they took upon themselves when they joined; but in any case the Government had no right to go to the whole Volunteer force and say it was necessary for them, if they came forward, to come within the operation of this clause, for the reason that, like soldiers, the Volunteers did not care to see one man going and another left behind because of his home or business ties.

*COLONEL SANDYS (Lancashire, Bootle) was of opinion that the Amendment for the provision of the Volunteers who were to garrison certain forts was a good one, but the men who should undertake that duty should be garrison artillery, and he hoped that the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary would see his way to accept the Amendment to that effect proposed by the hon. and gallant Gentleman opposite, which he (Colonel Sandys) intended to support.

MR. WYNDHAM said the majority would be garrison artillery. He did not trust his own judgment in this matter, and though the majority would be garrison artillery, still there necessarily would have to be others. It might be necessary, for instance, to have fifteen men on Brighton pier for the purposes of communications, and it was in matters of that kind that the Government ought not to be called upon to specify their requirements. They ought not to specify the particular composition of the garrisons. The only limitation could be a limitation of numbers; if that was pressed, he saw no means of resisting it.

SIR. H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN expressed a fear that he had not been clearly apprehended. He objected to a limited number, as he did not see that it would be of any service, because the only result would be that another Bill might have to be introduced in a very short time. What he desired to see was the clause restricted to the particular class of Volunteers who would be invited to undertake these duties. If the words "garrison artillery, submarine miners, and others necessary for coast defence," were incorporated, they would very nearly meet the objections raised.

MR. BUCHANAN desired to supplement the words of the right hon. Gentleman. He moved after the words "garrison artillery" in the proposed Amendment to add the words "submarine miners, engineers, and other forces for coast defence." That would include telegraphists, cyclists, and other people whom the Government desired to have; he thought such an Amendment as that would emphasise what was intended to be carried out.

*COLONEL BLUNDELL (Lancashire, Ince) said he wished to keep the Volunteer force as it was, and was glad that the Under Secretary had withdrawn the registration for service in the field and abroad. He thought the Amendment would cripple our power at a time when

we most wanted the use of force. He should like to see steps taken to prevent regimental pressure from being brought to bear on the Volunteers—even with regard to service at home.

MAJOR JAMESON said he thoroughly agreed with the Amendment. The hon. Member opposite proposed this limit in order that those who volunteered might not appear in a different light from their comrades.

*MR. WYLIE hoped that his hon. friend the Under Secretary of State for War would adhere to the exact terms he had proposed in connection with this clause. He did not think it could do any harm to give the whole of the Volunteers the option of being called out for service at any time.

MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN said there was an agreement in principle on both sides, and they were only now discussing how they could give effect to the general consensus of the House. He had handed in an Amendment, and he hoped that it might not be displaying undue partiality to say he thought it was better than that of his hon. friend the Member for Forfarshire. It was to add to sub-section (*a*), after the words, "military service," the words, "for coast defence duty." He hoped that the Under Secretary for War would adhere to the understanding that the whole body of Volunteers would not be called out for military duty at any time, but only those men intended to garrison forts.

CAPTAIN SINCLAIR asked leave to withdraw his Amendment. He could bring it up again on the Amendment of his hon. friend after the Under Secretary had had time to consider the proposal.

SIR JOHN BRUNNER (Cheshire, Northwich) said he hoped the Under Secretary would undertake to satisfy the scruples of hon. Members on that side of the House by introducing either now or later words which would limit the clause.

MR. WYNDHAM hoped that the Committee would be induced to advance a little further in the direction he had indicated in his Amendment. The Committee appeared to be on the eve of arriving at an agreement. He would undertake to amend his subsequent Amendment before Report by specifying the places more clearly—not by enumeration, but by some description, or whatever might be possible.

Mr. Buchanan's Amendment to the Amendment was, by leave, withdrawn, and the Amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. WYNDHAM moved to amend Clause 2 so that it should read as follows—

"It shall be lawful for Her Majesty to accept the offer of any member of a Volunteer corps to subject himself to the liability to be called out for actual military service at any time at such places in Great Britain as may be specified in his agreement."

He undertook before Report to bring up words which would specify the nature of those places more clearly than was now apparent from the words, and to make clear what had been their intention all along.

Amendment agreed to.

COMMANDER BETHELL (Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness) said his hon. friend had altered his position so much since the Second Reading that the whole character of the Bill was altered. He had given notice of an Amendment to carry out the view that they should take advantage of the services of Volunteers who were willing to take upon themselves active military service generally and for all purposes. As the hon. Gentleman had accepted the limitation imposed on him by the other side of the House, he would not press his Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 10, to leave out from second 'to' to end of line 14, and insert 'the liability to be called out for actual military service at any time at such places in Great Britain as may be specified in his agreement.'"—(*Mr. Wyndham.*)

Amendment agreed to.

MR. WYNDHAM said it was necessary to amend Clause 2 in order to ensure that officers should obtain the pensions and allowances which were provided for in the Volunteer Act of 1863.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, lines 17 and 18, to leave out 'and eighteen,' and insert 'to twenty.'"

Amendment agreed to.

Consequential Amendment made.

MR. BUCHANAN moved a proviso to the effect that regulations made under this section should not come into effect until they had lain four weeks upon the Table. The alterations of the law which would be effected by the Bill were of such a substantial character that the regulations should not become legally binding unless they were laid on the Table of the House and submitted to the judgment of Parliament.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 19, at the end, to add the word, 'Provided always that regulations made under this section shall not come into effect until they have lain four weeks upon the Table of each House of Parliament whilst that House is sitting.'"—(*Mr. Buchanan.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

MR. WYNDHAM said the hon. Member was labouring under a misapprehension. Nothing was being proposed which was beyond present powers.

MR. BUCHANAN said power was given to issue regulations which would have the effect of law.

MR. WYNDHAM said the sub-section simply enabled the Secretary of State to adapt Part 2 of the Volunteer Act of 1863 to the new conditions. That was not a matter which would be laid before the House. With all respect, the hon. Member was not Parliamentary draftsman to the War Office.

CAPTAIN SINCLAIR said it was a reasonable thing to suggest that if the Secretary for War was to have the power of varying the regulations applicable to the Volunteer force, the House should have some opportunity of expressing an opinion on them.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 60; Noes, 143. (Division List No. 232.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Allison, Robert Andrew
Austin, M. (Limerick, W.)
Billson, Alfred
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carvill, P. Geo. Hamilton
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Clark, Dr. G. B.
Crilly, Daniel
Doogan, P. C.
Evans, Sir Francis H (South'ton
Fenwick, Charles
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert J.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gurdon, Sir William Brampton
Hammond, John (Carlow)
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Healy, Maurice (Cork)
Healy, Timothy M. (N. Louth)
Hedderwick, Thomas C. H.
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
Lawson, Sir W. (Cumberland
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Macaleese, Daniel
MacDonnell, Dr M A (Queen's C
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
M'Ghee, Richard
M'Leod, John
Maddison, Fred.
Molloy, Bernard Charles
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Provand, Andrew Dryburgh
Samuel, J. (Stockton-on-Tees)
Scott, Charles P. (Leigh)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sinclair, Capt. John (Forfarsh.)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Stanhope, Hon. Philip J.
Steadman, William Charles
Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)
Sullivan, T. D. (Donegal, W.)
Tanner, Charles Kearns
Ure, Alexander
Wilson, John (Govan)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Buchanan and Sir John Brunner.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Baillie, James E. B. (Inverness)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Barry, Rt Hn A H Smith-(Hunts
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir. M H (Bristol)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Beckett, Ernest William
Bemrose, Sir Henry Howe
Bethell, Commander
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbys.)
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Hertford, East)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.)
Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Charrington, Spencer
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Fred. Lucas (Lambeth)
Cooke, C. W. Radcliffe (Heref'd
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cornwallis, Fiennes Stanley W.
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Curzon, Viscount
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Hart
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitz Wygram, General Sir F.
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Fry, Lewis
Garfit, William
Gedge, Sydney

Giles, Charles Tyrrell
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Rt Hn G. J. (St George's
Goschen, George J. (Sussex)
Gourley, Sir Edward Temperley
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Hamilton, Rt. Hn. Lord George
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robert W.
Hardy, Laurence
Henderson, Alexander
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Howell, William Tudor
Jackson, Rt. Hn. W. Lawies
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Keswick, William
Lafone, Alfred
Lawrence, Sir E Durning-(Corn
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks.)
Lea, Sir Thomas (Londonderry)
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewelyn, Sir Dillwyn-(Swnsea
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowles, John
Macartney, W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maclure, Sir John William
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Manners, Lord Edward W. J.
Mendl, Sigismund Ferdinand
Middlemore, J. Throgmorton
Monckton, Edward Philip
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, R. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, Hn. Fred (Monm'thsh.
Morrison, James A. (Wilts., S.)
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford)
Muntz, Philip A.
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Phillpotts, Captain Arthur
Pilkington, R. (Lancs, Newton)
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plunkett, Rt Hn Horace Curzon
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Rentoul, James Alexander
Richardson, Sir T. (Hartle'pl)
Ridley, Rt. Hon. Sir Matthew W
Ritchie, Rt Hon Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Russell, T. W. (Tyrone)
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Seely, Charles Hilton
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward J. (Somerset)
Stewart, Sir M. J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxford U.
Tollemache, Henry. James
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E. (Kent)
Welby, Lt.-Col. ACE (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Joseph Powell-(Birm
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, George
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Sir William Walrond and
Mr. Anstruther.

Question proposed, "That Clause 2, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

CAPTAIN SINCLAIR: If anything could justify the opposition we have offered to this Bill as a whole, it is the present condition of this clause. As a matter of fact, as originally introduced, the clause gave the Government power to accept the services of all Volunteers who agreed to serve in any part of the world. That meant imposing an additional liability of a very serious character on the whole of the Volunteer service. The result of the criticism to which the Bill has been subjected is that the character of the Bill has been completely changed. There is now no question of foreign service, and the application of the Bill, instead of being general with the whole Volunteer service, is to be limited. It is not too much to say that the case for the Bill has entirely broken down, and the opposition to the measure has served a most useful purpose and justified itself by the result. I regret that the Government, seeing that the limits of the Bill are so small, has not consented to acquiesce in the very general desire that any increase in the liabilities cast on the Volunteers should be deferred until the matter could be considered more dispassionately and under normal conditions.

MR. JOHN BURNS: I wish to emphasise the point raised by the hon. and gallant Member for Ince with regard to the method in which Volunteers offer their services. I would submit to the Under Secretary for War that in the regulations putting this Bill into operation the same conditions should apply as in the case of transfers from one regiment to another in the Regular Army. The hon. Gentleman knows that when Volunteers are asked for from, say, the 3rd Buffs, to enlist into, say, the East Surrey Regiment for the purpose of going, say, to India, what happens is that the colonel neither of the 3rd Buffs nor of the East Surrey, but of some other regiment, sits upon a day specified to receive the enlistments from the one regiment to the other. By that means you get impartiality, and the men volunteer of their own volition and without any pressure from their own colonel. What is good enough for the regular army ought to be good enough for the Volunteer regiments, and if the method adopted in the regular army is resorted to, we should not find Volunteers subjected to the invidious distinction to which many have been in connection with the South African war. I appeal to the hon. Gentleman that in the regulations which are issued he will follow the method laid down in the regular army.

Question put and agreed to.

Clauses 3 and 4 agreed to.

On the question that the Bill, as amended, be reported,

MR. JOHN BURNS asked that the point he had just raised might be replied to by the Under Secretary of State for War, as it was a matter of vital importance to the successful working of the Bill.

MR. WYNDHAM: I think I have given the hon. Member a general assurance not only that there will be no pressure, but that no need for pressure can possibly arise. I will, however, consider whether any specified course can be taken, but I cannot pledge myself to apply to the one force a method which may not be applicable to that force, while it may be to the other.

Bill reported, with Amendments; as amended, to be considered To-morrow.

RESERVE FORCES BILL [Lords].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER, Cumberland, Penrith, in the Chair.]

Clause 1:—

MR. BUCHANAN had on the Paper an Amendment to insert the following proviso—

"Provided always, that men in the second division liable to be called out under this section shall receive not less Army reserve pay than that received by men of the first division."

THE CHAIRMAN: The Amendment standing in the name of the hon. Member for East Aberdeenshire is out of order, because it would impose a fresh charge upon the taxpayer.

Question proposed, "That Clause 1 stand part of the Bill."

MR. BUCHANAN said that it would be somewhat hard if the men upon whom these new obligations were to be placed did not enjoy the same position and pay as those who constituted the first division and the Army Reserve. He, therefore, asked the Under Secretary of State to give an assurance that these men should receive the same remuneration as those upon whom the obligations at present rested.

MR. WYNDHAM: I can give the assurance asked for. I can even say that in the Supplementary Estimates, which I hope to introduce on Friday, a small sum will be allocated to meet the limited number of cases which are likely to accrue this year.

MR. BUCHANAN: It will not be necessary to put a provision in the Bill, I suppose?

MR. WYNDHAM: No.

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause 2:—

MR. WYNDHAM: I must move the Amendment on the Paper, although the necessity of it may seem a little in conflict with what I have just said. But there is a necessity, because in the Act to be amended the pay is laid down, and therefore, as we are amending the Act, it is necessary to put in these words in order to secure the proper pay.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 7, after 'and,' to add '(*d*) if under the foregoing provisions the rank of any such man in the Militia is raised or reduced above or below that which he held before he entered on permanent service his pay shall be correspondingly raised or reduced.'"—(*Mr. Wyndham.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Remaining clauses agreed to.

Bill reported, with the Amendment; as amended, to be considered To-morrow.

NAVAL RESERVE BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order for Second Reading read.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. GOSCHEN, St. George's, Hanover Square), who, in moving the Second Reading of this Bill, was very indistinctly heard, was understood to explain that the object of the Bill was to

attract to the new division of the Naval Reserve men of twelve years service who hitherto had not been induced to join the Royal Naval Reserve. The Admiralty attached great value to this additional reserve, as it was hoped to obtain men of higher position, who would be able to fill the posts of chief petty officers and petty officers in the Royal Naval Reserve, and so release a number of Regular officers at present occupied with those duties. These men would get sixpence per day as a retainer. It was also proposed to reorganise the present Seamen Pensioner Reserve. This was a simple Bill, but it was believed it would provide a large additional force.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Goschen.*)

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: There are one or two points which occur to me. I gather that this new Reserve will not be amalgamated with the Royal Naval Reserve.

MR. GOSCHEN: No.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: It will be left separate?

MR. GOSCHEN: Yes.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: There is one other question I wish to ask. Is there any limit of age or limit of service proposed? The words are "who have served." Is any standard of service required?

MR. GOSCHEN said there would be none over fifty years of age. There were many officers filling the position of chief petty officers who would be set free for active service, and it was hoped that greater efficiency of the Reserve would be secured.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: But is there any limit to the time which may have elapsed since their service in the Navy? Obviously a man who served when a boy would at the age of fifty-five have very little trace of the Navy left in him.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. MACARTNEY, Antrim, S.): Three years.

Mr. Goschen.

MR. JOHN BURNS: I trust the House will notice the significant language in the Memorandum to this Bill, and also the statement of the First Lord himself. I was greatly surprised to hear that experience has shown that few men who have served in the Navy join the present Naval Reserve, which now consists mainly of seamen of the mercantile marine and fishermen. The First Lord seems to be under the impression that he can get over this condition of things by offering to men who do not now join 6d. per day to join the Naval Reserve. Such a scheme will not overcome the prejudice of time-expired men against joining the Reserve. The First Lord in some respects is a man of sanguine temperament, but I do not believe he will get 15,000 men in the Naval Reserve for a retainer of 6d. per day. It is indeed significant that we should be told that the Royal Naval Reserve is so unpopular that the men will not join it. Is it due to the fact that when a sailor has done his twelve years in the Navy he has had enough of it, that he is disgusted with it to such an extent that he does not want to have anything more to do with it for the rest of his life? If that be so, it indicates that the conditions of employment in the Navy are so unattractive that the sailor views with pleasure the opportunity of ceasing all connection with the Navy at the expiration of his twelve years. I would suggest that instead of offering this retainer of 6d. per day for 15,000 men the right hon. Gentleman should consider the advisability of making the Navy during the twelve years service more popular by adding the sixpence per day to the pay of the sailor, thus increasing the interest of the men in the service while they are members of it, and perhaps stimulating among them a greater love for the Reserve when they leave the active ranks. I shall be glad to hear that there is some reason other than those I have suggested for the men not joining the Reserve, but I shall be agreeably surprised if at the end of twelve months, as a result of this sixpence per day retainer, the First Lord has more than 300 or 400 additional men in the Reserve. It appears to me that the condition of things is getting so unsatisfactory and intolerable, that when once a man has left the active ranks he is only too glad to have nothing to do with the Reserve.

MR. GOSCHEN, speaking by the indulgence of the House, said that the fact that the great majority of men continued from their twelve years service to the twenty-two years service proved that the service was not unpopular. The reason they did not join the Royal Naval Reserve was that they knew all the work of the Reserve, they knew all the drill, and there was a reluctance on their part to go through drills and so on, which were intended rather for recruits and men who had not been through the training that sailors of the Navy had. Inquiries had been made as to the probable success of the proposal, and it was understood that this offer would be an attraction to men who had left the service. It was not expected that the 15,000 men would be obtained at once. The 15,000 was the limit, and it was hoped that it would be reached in a certain number of years.

COMMANDER BETHELL: We have never yet made any efforts to secure the twelve years service men. Several times it has been suggested in Committee that something might be done to get these men back to the Reserve, but this is the first Bill ever placed before the House with that object. That my hon. friend is mistaken in his view about the popularity of the Navy is, I think, proved by the fact that such a very large proportion of the men, when their twelve years service expires, are only too anxious to serve the remaining term for a pension.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed for Thursday.

COLONIAL STOCK BILL [Lords].

[SECOND READING.]

Order for Second Reading read.

*THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.) said it had been the custom for many years to empower trustees in this country to invest in colonial stock, but the colonies had long desired that the power should exist where it was not specifically given in settlements. The matter required and had received a great deal of consideration, and it seemed to the Government that the proper basis on which to deal with it was that there should be some sort of security to trustees that the colonies would maintain good faith with their creditors, that they would respond to any judgment of the courts in this country, and would come under the limitations of the Colonial Stock Acts, thus differentiating colonial stock from foreign stock, which, of course, was not subject to Parliament, the courts of this country, or the action of the Government. Therefore, this Bill, in the case of trust money where there was no special authority to invest in colonial stock, would enable trustees to make such an investment, provided the colony concerned came under certain conditions to be laid down by the Treasury. Those conditions would be, in the first place, that the colony should thoroughly accept the legal position, that any legislation on its part detracting from or interfering with the security of its creditors would be properly vetoed by the Imperial Government; in the second place, that their stock should be brought under the regulations of the Colonial Stock Acts of this country; and thirdly, that the colony should provide from its own revenue for the satisfaction of any judgment of the courts given against it in the United Kingdom. Further, that the colony shall provide funds in the hands of an agent or firm of high standing and position here for that purpose. These conditions would be laid down by the Treasury, and would have to be assented to by any colony coming under the Bill. An arrangement had been come to with the Dominion of Canada, and colonial legislation had been passed for the fulfilment of these conditions, and a similar course would be pursued by any colony desiring to come under the Bill. In Committee he hoped to meet a suggestion that public notice should be given whereby trustees in this country might know the colonies in whose stock they might safely invest. He was quite sure all of them would be ready to do anything they could for the welfare of their colonial fellow subjects. He did not think he needed to say anything more, and he hoped the House would give the Bill a Second Reading.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

MR. HALDANE (Haddingtonshire): So far as this Bill proposes to extend the scope of those securities in which trustees may invest in Colonial stocks, it is a useful measure, but in so far as it relates to giving control to the Treasury, although it is comparatively small, I dislike it. It has been a tradition on the part of the Treasury—not in the time of the right hon. Gentleman, for this is a tradition which he has inherited from his predecessors—that it is their duty to take care of trustees not only in connection with Colonial stock but with every sort of investments. The policy of the Treasury has been systematically to prescribe the limits within which trustees may invest to an extent, which has not only proved a great embarrassment to trustees, but which has very much restricted the scope of what I think was a much better system. This Bill proposes to extend the scope of colonial investments in which trustees may invest, and so far this Bill is good. But what I very much demur to is the extent to which the Treasury is made the judge in this matter under this Bill, which I consider is the extension of a bad principle. How can the Treasury usefully supervise the conditions under which Colonial stock is to be deemed good or bad? It is all very easy in case of first-class colonies from a trustees' point of view, but when you come to deal with other Colonial stock what does this Bill hold out? On the one hand there is the Treasury and on the other hand the trustees, who, I think, would be able to form a much more reliable judgment than the Treasury. I do not think we shall get a satisfactory condition of trustee investments until the trustees are allowed to judge for themselves. I demur altogether to this guardianship of trustees by the Treasury, even under the right hon. Gentleman, who is one of the most sympathetic Chancellors of the Exchequer towards trustees. Even if this Bill were a larger measure I should take the sense of the House upon it, because I object to the principle of control by the Treasury which underlies it.

MR. COHEN (Islington, E.) said that with all respect to the views expressed by the hon. gentleman who had just sat down he thought this Bill would be welcomed not only by the Colonies but also by the trustees. The imprimatur of the Treasury, in his opinion, enhanced and safeguarded the value of Colonial stock.

MR. CALDWELL said he was sorry that a Bill of this importance should be brought forward at such a late period of the session. It had only recently come down from the House of Lords, and the House was asked to pass it without the opinion of the various legal bodies in the country being expressed upon it. The Bill applied to Scotland as well as to England, and so far as legislation of this kind was concerned the legal bodies in Scotland had always taken very great pains to furnish Scotch Members with reports upon Bills like this which were of such a technical character. On the present occasion they had had no opportunity whatever of communicating with those legal bodies or of obtaining their reports. This placed Scotch Members under a considerable disadvantage. Clause 1 made a very considerable change in the law, of which they had had no explanation. It proposed that—

> "For the purpose of enabling the Colonial Stock Acts, 1877 and 1892, to be applied to stock issued before the passing of this Act, it shall not be necessary that any prospectus, notice, stock certificate, coupon, dividend warrant, or other certificate or document issued before the passing of this Act in relation to the stock should state the particulars required to be stated therein by Section 19, of the Colonial Stock Act, 1877."

The Act of 1877 laid down most distinctly that the revenues of the colony were liable, and not the Consolidated Fund of Her Majesty's Treasury. He could quite understand how they might bring in the case of Canada, where the stock, although practically the same, were not identically similar. In 1892 the same question occurred about the giving of a certain amount of relief, and Section 19 of the Act of that year provided that the provisions of the Colonial Stock Act, 1877, should not apply to any stock in respect to which the provisions of that section had not been observed before the passing of the Act. That was a very reasonable provision in the Act of 1892. With regard to investments by trustees he thought the Chancellor of the Exchequer was going a little too far by declaring that the trustees should be at liberty to invest in Colonial stock subject to certain conditions laid down by the Treasury. He thought it would be better to have Colonial stock put

on a proper legal footing. How were the trustees to know whether the conditions of the Treasury had been complied with or not? It was provided in the Bill that they should be set forth in the *London Gazette*, but he wondered how many people read the *London Gazette* to ascertain what had been published there. But, supposing they read the *London Gazette*, how would they know that the conditions had been complied with? He thought those conditions should be put into the Act of Parliament, and a certificate should be required that those conditions had been fulfilled in the case of certain stock. If the Chancellor of the Exchequer would examine the Colonial Stock Acts of 1877 and 1892 he would find that they provided for a register in this country. At any rate the Bill requires considerable care in its preparation, and he thought the House would agree with him that an important question of this kind ought not to be rushed through the House at this period of the session without very careful consideration. It was important that the legal bodies in England and Scotland should have an opportunity of considering this measure.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: Scotland will be able to do the same thing under this Bill as she is able to do at present under the authority of the Courts.

MR. CALDWELL said he had not looked up the point, and he did not profess to carry the Act of Parliament in his head. He did not know whether the Chancellor of the Exchequer had had his attention drawn to Section 15 of the Act of 1877. It was now proposed to repeal that section, although the law at the present moment provided that the transaction should be entered upon the register. Was it not a very strange thing, when making any alteration in the law, that they should give power to trustees to invest money in Colonial stock, when, according to the law, no trust could be entered on the register? If trustees were to be allowed to invest in Colonial stock, then by all means that stock should be inscribed upon the register. Under these circumstances he hoped that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would give a little more time for the consideration of this Bill. This was not a party measure at all, and there was nothing contentious about it, but he thought the conditions imposed by the Treasury ought to have the judgment of the House pronounced upon them. He did not think that a matter of this kind ought to be left entirely to regulations to be drawn up by the Treasury. He did not agree with his hon. and learned friend the Member for Haddington that this was a matter for the judges. He believed it was a matter for the Treasury and for the House, and he thought they ought to know what conditions the Treasury were going to impose.

MR. LOWLES (Shoreditch, Haggerston) thought the measure would be very warmly welcomed by all the colonies.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar): I am entirely in accord with the principle of this Bill, but I am bound to say that I see some force in the objection raised by my hon. and learned friend. I have the good fortune, or the misfortune, of being a trustee of several marriage settlements, and I am bound to say that I think this Bill throws very great difficulties in the way of those who are trustees. Looking at this Bill as a trustee I should not be inclined to invest trust money for which I am responsible in Colonial stock, because the Bill is so complicated. The measure is another instance of legislation by reference of which we have far too much in this House. The measure gives power to the Treasury to make certain rules to be published in the *London Gazette*, but it is so complicated that I am afraid it will not facilitate very much the investment of trust money in Colonial stock. I think it would be better to introduce a Bill which would enable the trustee to know exactly how he stood in regard to this matter, and which would throw a little more light upon the subject.

*SIR M. HICKS-BEACH said if the hon. Gentleman did not want to invest money in colonial stock he need not do so.

SIR JAMES JOICEY (Durham, Chester-le-Street) said he was very glad to hear the statement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, for he confessed he looked with some doubt upon the Treasury in taking up this question. No one recognised more than he did the advantage to

the colonists in bringing their funds under the ordinary trusts settlements, but after all he thought, when the Treasury made a move of this kind, it should take such a form as would protect trustees, so that they would have no doubt whether the funds were as safe as our own. He agreed with his hon. friend that the difficulty had been in investing trust funds. In these days, when judges construed the responsibilities of trustees so very closely, the Treasury ought to be most careful in extending the area for trust investments.

MR. BANBURY (Camberwell, Peckham) said he was sorry the right hon. Gentleman had taken this opportunity of enabling colonial stock to become trust stock. On several occasions it had been found that the finance of colonies had not been well managed, and he did not see that at the present moment there was any particular necessity to make a change in this direction. The facilities it would give to the colonies to borrow on cheaper terms would be increased, and he did not think the colonists had yet shown themselves to be quite alive to the position they should feel if their stocks were to be regarded as trustee stocks. They were rather too much inclined to borrow money for all kinds of purposes, some of them, he thought, with the idea of catching votes rather than making good use of the money.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed for To-morrow.

IMITATION OF COUNTY COURT PROCESS BILL [Lords].

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

MR. HALDANE asked the Attorney General to give an explanation of the object of the Bill.

MR. CALDWELL also asked for an explanation of the Bill, and particularly as to the method of procedure in the case of an accused person. He did not think it would be reasonable in a matter of this kind to proceed by way of contempt of court. Was he to be tried under the Summary Procedure Act? In that case the procedure would be cheap, and there would be an appeal on questions of law to the higher courts. On conviction he was liable to a fine of not exceeding £10. Supposing a man committed the offence more than once, why should it be a fine? If a man repeated an act of that kind, imprisonment without the option of a fine might be given. He objected to Bills being brought into the House at this period of the session, when they had not time to examine them.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs) said that he did not make a statement with regard to the object of the Bill in moving the Second Reading, because the measure was short and simple. The Bill was directed against the offence of sending out a summons for payment intending to convey the impression that the summons really proceeded from a county court. That was a serious offence which it was highly desirable to check summarily. Of course it was implied that the document sent emanated from an official of the court. The question of increasing the penalty for a repetition of the offence was a matter for discussion in Committee.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.) asked if there were any statistics to show whether the offence prevailed in London or in any particular parts of the country.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: I am not in a position to give any statistics on the subject, but I have reason to believe that the offence is not an uncommon one.

MR. MAURICE HEALY said that the object of the Bill was a good one; but it seemed to create a sort of summary criminal jurisdiction in the county court. If the county court process was imitated, that was a criminal offence which should be treated like any other criminal offence. He asked the Attorney General to give some information on that point.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said the nature of the offence was really contempt of court. The process would be by motion. [AN HON. MEMBER: Why not have a jury?] If the hon. Member

wished an Amendment of that sort there would be no chance of the Bill becoming law. The offence was one which bore very hardly on the poor. There ought to be some way of checking an abuse which did not affect the more intelligent classes and those who were well to do. It affected only the poor and ignorant, and it was only they who could be taken in by tricks of this kind. It was for their protection that the Bill had been brought in.

MR. T. M. HEALY said this was to be done by motion before the county court judge. That was a novel procedure. So far as he could understand, the Bill applied to Ireland, and he saw no ground why it should not. Perhaps the Attorney General for Ireland would be good enough to inform him how the motion was to be made? Were rules to be made? Who was the aggrieved party to give notice? This Bill came to them from the House of Lords. He was filled with gratitude to that House for sending them a Bill for the protection of the poor man. There was the greatest anxiety for the poor on the Treasury benches. The Workmen's Compensation Act was to provide for the poor, and no lawyer was to come within a hundred miles of the poor. Yet that Act had been nothing but one for lawyers. The poor man was to be protected by this Bill. He respectfully said that a measure of this kind fell beneath contempt. If the Government could not engage themselves on better legislation they should dissolve.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 113; Noes, 11. (Division List No. 233.)

AYES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Baillie, James E. B. (Inverness)
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds)
Banbury, Frederick George
Barry, Rt Hn A H Smith- (Hunts
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Beckett, Ernest William
Bemrose, Sir Henry Howe
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Billson, Alfred
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Caldwell, James
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)
Cecil, Evelyn (Hertford, E.)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.)
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r
Channing, Francis Allston
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Charrington, Spencer
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Cornwallis, Fiennes Stanley W.
Cross, Herb. Sheph'd (Bolton)
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Curzon, Viscount
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Faber, George Denison
Fellowes, Hn. Ailwyn Edward
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Flower, Ernest
Fry, Lewis
Gedge, Sydney
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Goschen, Rt Hn. G. J. (St. Geor's
Goschen, George J. (Sussex)
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Hamilton, Rt. Hon. Lord G.
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robert W.
Hardy, Laurence
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hermon-Hodge, R. Trotter
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Howell, William Tudor
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.
Lawrence, Sir E. Durning (Corn-
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cumb'l'nd
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Lewis, John Herbert
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Lough, Thomas
Macartney, W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maclure, Sir John William
Malcolm, Ian
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Middlemore, John T.
More, Robert J. (Shropshire)
Morgan, Hon. F. (Monm'thsh.
Morrison, James A. (Wilts. S.)
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Newdigate, Francis Alexand'r
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Pease, Herbert P. (Darlington
Phillpotts, Captain Arthur
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plunkett, Rt. Hon. H. Curzon
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Purvis, Robert
Rankin, Sir James
Rentoul, James Alexander
Richardson, Sir Thos (Hartlep'l)
Ridley, Rt. Hn. Sir Matthew W.
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. C. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Russell, T. W. (Tyrone)
Samuel, J. (Stockton-on-Tees)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick, B.)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hon Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Ed. Jas. (Somerset)
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Warde, Lt.-Col. C. E. (Kent)
Welby, Lt.-Cl. A. C. E. (Taunton
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, George
Wyvill, Marmaduke D'Arcy
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Austin, M. (Limerick, W.)
Clark, Dr. G. B.
Doogan, P. C.
Hayden, John Patrick
Lambert, George
Macaleese, Daniel
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)
Sullivan, T. D. (Donegal, W.)
Tanner, Charles Kearns

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. T. M. Healy and Mr. Maurice Healy.

Bill read a second time, and committed for To-morrow.

PUBLIC WORKS LOANS BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 1 :—

Amendment proposed—

"In Clause 1, page 1, line 13, to leave out 'Edward Howley Palmer, Esquire.'"—(*Mr. Hanbury.*)

MR. T. M. HEALY asked why this respectable gentleman's name was being omitted.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH said that some time ago Mr. Palmer had asked to be relieved of his duties.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, to leave out 'Lord Iveagh.'"—(*Mr. Hanbury.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, after line 2, to insert 'The Honourable James Henry Cecil Hozier, M.P.'"—(*Mr. Hanbury.*)

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid) said he desired to know why Mr. Hozier's name was going to be inserted. Was everything going to be made a family matter? He had nothing to say against Scotchmen, but he wanted to know how it came to pass that Mr. Hozier was chosen for this position? Was it a remunerative position or was it not, and was Mr. Hozier a member of the Prime Minister's family or was he not?

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 2, after the last-mentioned name to insert 'David Lloyd-George, Esq., M.P.'"

Amendment agreed to.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 2 :—

MR. HERBERT LEWIS said he wished to know why the amount had been reduced from seven millions to six millions, and further, whether it was not a fact that of the six millions four and a half millions had been already pledged to various local bodies for the purpose of public works.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. HANBURY, Preston) said that the grant of seven millions last year was a very special one indeed, and was very considerably larger than the average. In 1896 it was only one and a half millions; in 1897, two and a half millions; in 1898, five millions; and therefore he thought that six millions now was a very fair average.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS said that as there was now a Welsh representative on the Board he was sure that they would get justice, and he therefore would not move his Amendment.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 3 :—

MR. T. M. HEALY asked why it was that gentlemen having large property should be allowed to escape these loans. There was a Mr. Lambert, who had been advanced £500 and had only repaid £82. It was the invariable practice of the Government in Ireland, while pressing small tenant farmers for every shilling, to let the landlords off. Here was a man whose name was perfectly familiar to them, who was let off of a sum of over £400, whereas a tenant in Ireland would not be let off 4d. He was first inducted into the mystery of public loans by the First Lord of the Treasury, who, he remembered, in 1881 attacked Mr. Gladstone for his iniquities in connection with them. The right hon. Gentleman then made a great impression on him. He took a stand now on the case of Mr. Lambert, and he wished to know why he was to get off paying over £400.

MR. HANBURY said that, as the hon. Gentleman no doubt knew very well, Mr. Lambert was not getting off at all,

because the debt remained, although it was wiped off the assets of the Local Loans Fund, which had to be done, of course, in the interests of the fund itself. The Treasury did not forego any claim to recover the money so far as it was recoverable. He was bound to say that the advance to Mr. Lambert was rather a foolish advance. There were two advances —one in 1874, and the other in 1881.

MR. T. M. HEALY: The Tory Government was in for the first lot.

MR. HANBURY said whatever Government was in did not now matter. The fact was that there was a large head rent, and sufficient regard had not been paid to that when making the advances. The payment of the head rent fell into arrear, and in order to save eviction and loss a salvage creditor paid off the arrears of the head rent and became, therefore, entitled to first priority over the other creditors. Ultimately the land was sold for £800, and nearly £600 went to satisfy the claims of the salvage creditor.

MR. CALDWELL said that the Secretary of the Treasury had stated that the amount of the advances might be eventually recovered, but according to another statement of his the advances were irrecoverable. In this case the money was lent for the purpose of erecting buildings and putting down subsoil. Who was to get the benefit of it? He supposed it would be the head-rent man. It was not fair that money should be spent in this way on property which practically belonged to another man, and out of which the Government would never get a single penny. This case only illustrated the principle on which these loans were given in Ireland.

MR. T. M. HEALY said that J. Fitzgerald received a loan of £3,000 for the purchase of his holding, which, of course, was said to be the value of the asset. The Government now wiped off £2,800. In other words, the holding on which they advanced £3,000 was not worth anything like that amount. They heard a great deal when the Home Rule proposal was before the country about the iniquity of Mr. Gladstone proposing to lend money for the purchase of Irish land. They were told it would be practically irrecoverable. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham made a great deal of the plea that the money would be irrecoverable, but here J. Fitzgerald got £3,000, and walked off with £2,800, £200 being the value of the land.

MR. HANBURY said this was one of the unfortunate cases in which a purchase took place from one relation to another. A certain proportion of the money would be recoverable. The value of the land had deteriorated very much from the condition in which it was when sold. He admitted that this was a case where the sum lent was larger than it ought to have been.

MR. T. M. HEALY said they had protested over and over again against the system of fathers transferring land to sons, and mothers transferring land to daughters, and borrowing money from the State under the pretence that this was land purchase. They were entitled to know the name of the Commissioner. It was very regrettable that the money should be wasted, but those who were testifying year after year against this extravagant system in Ireland were not listened to.

MR. HANBURY said the rent of the land was £150. He did not know the name of the Commissioner, but he would ascertain for the hon. and learned Member.

MR. JONATHAN SAMUEL (Stockton) said that, the restitution fund having been abolished, they ought to know out of what fund the Government proposed to pay the sums which they intended to wipe off this year.

MR. HANBURY said that what happened was that the loss to the Local Loans Fund was made good by a Vote of Parliament, and if any sums were subsequently recovered they were paid into the Exchequer.

MR. T. M. HEALY said it was understood that a fifth was always retained by the Government in such cases. The advance in this case for was £3,000, of which a fifth would be £600. Therefore only £2,400 should have been lost, whereas £2,800 was actually lost. Why was not a fifth retained? He did not for a moment suggest that the Secretary to

the Treasury was in any degree responsible, and doubtless the right hon. Gentleman had not the smallest sympathy with what he was defending. He would suggest to the right hon. Gentleman that he should supply the date of the loan, the name of the Commissioner making the advance, the name of the valuer, and the Poor-law valuation. If the Land Commissioners knew that such details would be set out in a Public Loans Bill they would be much more careful.

MR. HANBURY said he entirely agreed with the hon. Gentleman. He thought more light should be thrown on these transactions, and he would undertake that in future the fullest information should be given. He had already given the name of the valuer, and would endeavour to obtain the name of the Commissioner. As for the fifth which had been retained, it was all exhausted in paying instalments.

DR. TANNER said he should like to ask the right hon. Gentleman who J. Fitzgerald was? He happened to know East Cork very well, and there was only one James Fitzgerald there as far as he knew. He was an agent and had grabbed a certain number of farms in the district. He did not want to put it in a painful way, but that James Fitzgerald had a brother, an hon. Baronet sitting in the House for an English constituency. In such matters the process of identification ought to be gone through thoroughly. If he were the gentleman he imagined, he should not have any difficulty in getting a loan, because he was agent to Lord Middleton.

MR. CALDWELL said he thought the Secretary to the Treasury would admit that it was quite proper that attention should be called to the matter, and that it should be gone into in more detail than usual. When money was being advanced on property in Ireland it should be done on business lines. The loan for £2,000, which the Committee was discussing, was only an illustration of how a bogus sale could be got up. The sale in that case was made by a mother to a son, and at that time it was represented that the rent of the property was £150. In 1899, however, only £58 could be got for it. In such cases the parties walked off with the money, leaving the Treasury to bear the loss. He thought they might reasonably have a statement showing for several years past the names and addresses of persons whose loans had been written off, and how much had been recovered. It was only right that the persons who were responsible for advancing money in Ireland should be impressed with the fact that the House of Commons would see that proper security was got for the advance, and that if a loss were incurred it would be enquired into. It was only in that way that the matter could be kept on a business principle, and he hoped after what had taken place that the Treasury would see the necessity for issuing special instructions.

Clause agreed to.

Bill reported, as amended, to be considered To-morrow.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

On the Motion for Adjournment:—

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It may be for the convenience of the House if I say that after consultation I have come to the conclusion that the most convenient course for the House would be that the Colonial Vote should be taken on Wednesday.

MR. TOMLINSON: When will the Companies Bill be taken?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The Companies Bill will be the first Order To-morrow.

MR. T. M. HEALY said he hoped the Irish Intermediate Education Bill would not be taken after twelve o'clock. If it were to be taken To-morrow it ought to be taken at an early hour.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that the Companies Bill was the most important Bill that now remained to be discussed, and he could not hold out any hope that they would be able to take the Intermediate Education Bill at an early hour To-morrow.

Adjourned at a quarter after One of the clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, 24th July, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

SHANNON WATER AND ELECTRIC POWER BILL.

Witnesses ordered to attend the Select Committee, two to produce documents.

SOUTH WALES ELECTRICAL POWER DISTRIBUTION BILL.

Committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

GREAT GRIMSBY STREET TRAMWAYS BILL [H.L.].

MARGATE PIER AND HARBOUR BILL [H.L.].

Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to.

FARNWORTH URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL BILL.

RICKMANSWORTH AND UXBRIDGE VALLEY WATER BILL.

NEWRY, KEADY, AND TYNAN LIGHT RAILWAY BILL.

Reported with Amendments.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 9) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 14) BILL.

Reported from the Select Committee without amendment, and committed to a Committee of the whole House on Thursday next.

ST. DAVID'S RAILWAY (ADDITIONAL POWERS) BILL.

The CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES informed the House, That the promoters do not intend to proceed further with the Bill. Ordered that the Bill be not further proceeded with.

LONDON COUNTY TRAMWAYS (No. 2) BILL.

Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

NORTH METROPOLITAN ELECTRIC POWER SUPPLY BILL.

Moved, That the Order made on the 12th day of March last, "That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after Tuesday the 26th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2^a; agreed to. Bill read 2^a accordingly, and committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

GREAT INDIAN PENINSULA RAILWAY COMPANY BILL.

Read 3^a, and passed.

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL (MONEY) BILL.

Read 3^a, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

ILFRACOMBE IMPROVEMENT BILL.

Read 3^a, with the Amendments; further Amendments made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.

LONDON AND NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY (WALES) BILL.

EAST LONDON WATER BILL.

LONDON AND NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY BILL.

BLACKPOOL, ST. ANNE'S, AND LYTHAM TRAMWAYS BILL.

Read 3^a, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 1) BILL.

PIER AND HARBOUR PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 2) BILL.

GREAT NORTHERN RAILWAY BILL.

HASTINGS TRAMWAYS BILL.

LAMBETH WATER BILL.

Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

LANCASHIRE, DERBYSHIRE, AND EAST COAST RAILWAY BILL.

MIDLAND RAILWAY BILL.

Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

BURY AND DISTRICT WATER (TRANSFER) BILL [H.L.].

PRESTON CORPORATION BILL [H.L.].

Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments; the said Amendments considered, and agreed to.

SOUTH WALES ELECTRICAL POWER DISTRIBUTION BILL.

NORTH METROPOLITAN ELECTRIC POWER SUPPLY BILL.

Report from the Committee of Selection that the five Lords appointed a Select Committee on the Durham (County of) Electric Power Supply, and other Bills, do form the Select Committee for the consideration of the South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Bill and the North Metropolitan Electric Power Supply Bill; read, and agreed to; all petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Bills to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Bills.

DURHAM (COUNTY OF) ELECTRIC POWER SUPPLY BILL.

LANCASHIRE ELECTRIC POWER BILL.

SHANNON WATER AND ELECTRIC POWER BILL.

SOUTH WALES ELECTRICAL POWER DISTRIBUTION BILL.

NORTH METROPOLITAN ELECTRIC POWER SUPPLY BILL.

Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Duke of Argyll be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Lord Brassey, and that the Duke of Argyll be Chairman of the said Committee; read, and agreed to.

LONDON (ST. MARYLEBONE) PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

Moved, That the Order made on the 12th day of March last, "That no Provisional Order Confirmation Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after Tuesday, the 26th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2^a; agreed to. Bill read 2^a accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the whole House.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 4) BILL.

House in Committee (according to Order). Amendments made; Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received on Thursday next.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

ARMY.

Statement of Stores transferred from Navy to land service for South Africa up to 31st December, 1899.

QUEEN'S COLLEGE, BELFAST.

Report of the President for the year 1899–1900.

TREATY SERIES, No. 15 (1900).

Convention between the United Kingdom and Uruguay renewing the treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation of 13th November, 1885; signed at Monte Video 15th July, 1899 (ratifications exchanged at Monte Video 9th June, 1900).

TRADE REPORTS.

Annual Series: No. 2484. Trade of Frankfort-on-Main for the year 1899.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

POLICE ACT, 1890.

Correspondence relative to the refusal of the Secretary of State's certificate, under Section 17 (2) of the Act, to the River Tyne Police Force for the year ended 29th September, 1899. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

COUNTY AND BOROUGH FRANCHISE ASSIMILATION (LONDON) BILL.

Reported from the Standing Committee without amendment, and to be read 3^a on Thursday next.

TOWN COUNCILS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Reported from the Standing Committee with further Amendments; the Report of the Amendments made in Committee of the whole House and by the Standing Committee to be received on Thursday next, and Bill to be printed as amended. (No. 209.)

TITHE RENT-CHARGE (IRELAND) BILL.

Reported from the Standing Committee without further amendment; the Report of the Amendments made in Committee of the whole House to be received on Thursday next.

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES ACT (1890) AMENDMENT BILL.

Reported from the Standing Committee without further Amendment; the Report of the Amendments made in Committee of the whole House to be received on Thursday next.

CRUELTY TO WILD ANIMALS IN CAPTIVITY BILL.

Amendments reported (according to Order), and Bill to be read 3ª on Thursday next.

AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

*THE LORD PRIVY SEAL (Viscount CROSS): Your Lordships, no doubt, are aware that the provisions of the Agricultural Holdings Act have been very much discussed up and down the country by chambers of agriculture and other bodies, and that a Commission was appointed to inquire into the working of the Agricultural Holdings Act. That Commission reported in, I think, 1898. In consequence of the Report of that Commission this Bill is now brought forward. I may say at once that the great object of the Bill is to simplify procedure and to relieve friction between landlord and tenant as far as that can be done. The foundation of all compensation—the measure of compensation—must eventually be no doubt the value to the incoming tenant of the improvement done by the outgoing tenant. Whatever the value to the incoming tenant may be, that is the measure of the compensation which ought to be given. Probably, my simplest course will be to go very shortly through the different clauses of the Bill—there are very few of them—and explain their provisions, as I hope I shall be able to do at no very great length. The first clause of the Bill re-enacts the old clause of the Act of 1883, but with this distinction. In the first sub-section it re-enacts the old clause of the Act of 1883, but it leaves out a particular proviso—

"Provided always that in estimating the value of any improvement in the first schedule hereto, there shall not be taken into account as part of the improvement made by the tenant what is justly due to the inherent capabilities of the soil."

Those words have been left out, and I should not have wasted the time of your Lordships at the present moment in discussing the matter at any length, because it is more a matter for Committee than for this stage; but I see that a noble Earl on the other side of the House (Lord Grey) has given notice to re-insert those words. I would only, in passing, call the attention of the House to the Report of the Commission on that particular point. They say—

"The Central Chamber of Agriculture recommend that those words should be struck out. Mr. Lipscombe, the chairman of the Committee, who drew the Report, said that they had received a great number of suggestions from affiliated Chambers in different parts of the kingdom, and that a great proportion of these Chambers recommended the abolition of the proviso. Giving his own opinion, he said:—'I believe, practically, that it has not at all safe-guarded the interests of the landowner or of the incoming tenant, but that it has afforded an opportunity of cavilling at the Act unfairly. . . . I believe it has been inoperative, but it is constantly asserted by persons who, perhaps, know more theoretically than practically that it has operated against the outgoing tenant.'"

I should not have referred to that at the present moment if it had not been for the notice of Amendment which has been already given by the noble Earl opposite. That is a matter which will be discussed, of course, when we get into Committee. The second sub-section of the first clause simply refers to the schedules, about which I shall have to say a word or two by-and-by. The third and fourth sub-sections have one very important bearing upon this matter. The first sub-section relates to the compensation payable to the tenant under the principal Act, and says that—

"There shall be taken into account any benefit which the landlord has given or allowed to the tenant in consideration of the tenant executing the improvement."

The 4th Sub-section relates to the question of manures. But the important alteration of the law which is made by this section is this. The foundation of the whole matter is that a claim must be made by the tenant. If the tenant does not make the claim the landlord is left to his own remedy for any breach of covenant that the tenant may have committed; but under the present law if the tenant makes a claim and the landlord makes a counter-claim for damages as against the tenant he may set off any money that he gets in consequence of his claim,

but he cannot go beyond the original claim of the tenant. Therefore it may be that if the tenant claims so much, and the landlord claims a much larger sum for what has been done against the improvement, although the landlord can set it off against the tenant's claim he cannot go beyond the tenant's claim. The Bill that I present to your Lordships alters that, and says that when it comes to arbitration, if the tenant claims and the landlord counter-claims and the counter-claim exceeds the tenant's claim, the landlord may under this Bill get what he ought to have in the counter-claim, and not simply be confined to a reduction of the claim that is made by the tenant. The 5th Sub-section of Clause 1 is to remedy a very curious state of things which exists under Clause 57 of the present Act. Under that clause the tenant was to come under the Act, and if he came under the Act then he was not to have any other remedy than the Act provided. That was supposed so to work that the Act should always be put into force; but under the existing law the tenant had to give notice of the claim, and therefore if the tenant neglected to give notice, or purposely did not give notice, he kept his right to any other remedy besides that under the Act. Therefore that section of the old Act of 1883 became practically of no avail whatever, and in this particular clause we have said that it leaves the tenant his remedy if he chooses to take it, leaving the law as it stands in practice although not in theory. Then we come to the second clause, which is a matter of, I think, very great importance. The second clause relates to arbitration. The great object of this Bill is to simplify the procedure with regard to arbitration. The Arbitration Act of 1889 may be said to be very simple, but that can hardly be applied to this particular Bill without great modifications, and it must be remembered that the Act of 1889 does not apply to Scotland at all, and therefore it is thought better, as those modifications are very difficult to introduce simply as modifications, to re-enact those parts of the Act of 1889 which are applicable, and to modify such parts as are not applicable and to place all the new procedure in the schedule to this Act so that, as this Act has probably to be worked not by lawyers but by laymen, they should have the whole procedure before them. That has seemed to us a very much simpler and better way of drafting the Bill than by reference or modification. Now, of course, the foundation of everything is the tenant's claim. Under the existing law the tenant had to give notice of his claim. That formal notice is by this Bill done away with, and the only limitation that is put on the tenant's right to claim is this—that it must be made before the determination of the tenancy; it cannot be made afterwards. With regard to such a claim when it comes before the court, the provisions of the Bill are certainly, I think, very advantageous both to the landlords and to the tenants. The Bill says—

"(3.) Where any such claim by a tenant for compensation is referred to arbitration, and any sum is claimed to be due to the tenant from the landlord in respect of any breach of contract or otherwise in respect of the holding, or to the landlord from the tenant in respect of any waste wrongfully committed or permitted by the tenant, or in respect of breach of contract or otherwise in respect of the holding, the party claiming such sum may, if he thinks fit, by written notice (not later than seven days from the commencement of the arbitration) to the other party require that the arbitration shall extend to the determination of the claim, and thereupon the provisions of this section with respect to arbitration shall apply accordingly, and any sum awarded to be paid by a landlord or tenant shall be recoverable in manner provided by the principal Act for the recovery of compensation."

So that to prevent any dispute between the landlord and the tenant it may all be settled in one arbitration with a great saving of expense and trouble and annoyance. That, in my opinion, is a very wise provision in the Bill. It is also provided that unless the parties agree to anything else, it shall be decided by a single arbitrator. The 3rd Clause relates to the land charges. They are at the present moment made by the county court in the cases where land charges apply. That is found very inconvenient for many reasons, and very expensive. In the first place, the county court is not always sitting. It may be some time before you can get the land charges fixed, and therefore it has been decided that the question of the land charges shall be left, not to the county court as at present, but to the Board of Agriculture, who will do the business very much more cheaply and expeditiously than it has been done under the county court. By the 4th Section the provisions of Section 34 of the principal Act are to apply to any

fixture not simply put up by the tenant according to the existing law, but if he has acquired or bought it. Then comes a new provision which alters the law, and I should say alters the law in a very popular way. The landlord, except by agreement under the present law, has no power to enter on the holding in order to see that the lease, or whatever it may be, is properly carried out, but by Clause 5—

"The landlord of a holding, or any person authorised by him, may at all reasonable times enter on the holding or any part of it for the purpose of viewing the state of the holding."

That seems to me to be really common sense, and a thing I should think there could be no possible objection to. Then there is a new provision in the next clause about penal rents and liquidated damages. This clause puts an end to penal rents and liquidated damages, except in certain peculiar cases. It is—

"Provided that this section shall not apply to any covenant or condition against breaking up permanent pasture, grubbing underwoods, or felling, cutting, lopping, or injuring trees, or regulating the burning of heather."

Those are matters which so very seriously injure the holding that they are purposely excepted from this particular clause. I think I have now gone through most of the provisions of this Bill with which it is necessary to trouble your Lordships at the present time, with one exception, and that is the schedules. I said that I would refer to the schedules later on, and I will do so very shortly. I do not think it is necessary for me at any length at the present moment to go very narrowly into the question of these schedules, but there are two points which are certainly of interest. In the first schedule, which relates to those matters in which you must get the consent of a landlord, a new provision is put in. It is not simply the erection or the enlargement of buildings, but the erection, alteration, or enlargement of buildings, and the word "alteration" has been inserted perfectly rightly, to my mind, and I think it will be a great advantage in working out, but no doubt it is one part of the schedule to which attention will be called by some of your Lordships when we get into Committee. As your Lordships are aware, at the present moment the making or planting of osier beds, the making of gardens, or the planting of orchards or fruit bushes, all require the consent of the landlord, but as the Bill now stands, provided that the gardens, or osier beds, or orchards, or fruit bushes do not exceed one acre, then the matter is transferred to the second schedule, in which the consent of the landlord is not wanted, but in which case notice must be given to him, the effect of notice being that when the landlord receives notice, if he chooses, he may do the improvement himself and charge the tenant with a certain rate of interest on the money which is expended. But added to the first schedule, in which not only notice must be given to the landlord, but his consent must also be obtained, the old Act included the making of permanent fences, but the words now introduced are "making or removal of permanent fences," which of course is a great protection to the landlord and one that I think ought to be carried into effect. Those, my Lords, are the provisions of this Bill. I shall be very happy at a future stage to make any further explanation which your Lordships may desire, but I have thought it best to state the provisions as shortly as I can. I hope your Lordships will give the Bill a Second Reading.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*The Lord Privy Seal.*)

LORD BURGHCLERE: I hope I may congratulate the noble Viscount on the very lucid manner in which he has explained the provisions of this Bill. It will not be necessary for me, fortunately, to detain your Lordships for more than a very brief time in any remarks which I may venture to make on the measure which the noble Viscount has just introduced. A supporter of Her Majesty's Government in another place, and one who I know from considerable experience is a very competent judge of agricultural matters, has stated that this Bill is merely a "small amending measure." It principally concerns itself, as the Lord Privy Seal has pointed out, with the simplification and cheapening of the existing methods by which arbitration between landlord and tenant is brought about. Now, my Lords, I am sure that all of us at the present moment are agreed that it is highly desirable and highly advantageous, both for the landlord and the tenant, and for the agricultural interests in the country generally, that the culti-

vator of a holding should have full and fair compensation for any improvements which he may make during his tenancy, and therefore it is obvious that it is very desirable and very advantageous that any settlement of difficulties by arbitration which may arise between landlord and tenant should be as expeditious and as cheap as is consistent with fair play to both parties in the case. As I have said, and as has been pointed out by the noble Viscount, the sole object—the main object, at any rate—of this Bill is to simplify and cheapen the procedure by which the arbitration is brought about between landlord and tenant, and in so far as this measure properly fulfils that very laudable purpose I am sure there will be no feeling in any part of the House except one of welcome to the measure which has just been introduced. But, my Lords, so complicated and technical is the law relating to landlord and tenant in this country, and so very complex is the legislation which deals with those relations in this country, that it is almost impossible to deal with even the fringe of this subject without arousing susceptibilities and inspiring perhaps fears in some quarter or another. This Bill, in my humble opinion, does not depart from that rule, but as those difficulties mainly refer to matters of detail and not to matters of principle, I think that they are more germane to the Committee stage of the Bill than to its Second Reading. There are, however, one or two points of general interest which I should like to be allowed to refer to very briefly. In the first place, as the noble Viscount has pointed out, for the first time in the history of agricultural holdings that oft-debated phrase, "the inherent capabilities of the soil," disappears from the Statute-book. I hear from the noble Viscount that there are noble Lords in this House who regret the elimination of that phrase, and who wish to see it re-introduced into the legislation of the country. It may be so. I would venture to refer them to the definition which is given of that particular phrase in a text-book which is very often accepted as a proper explanation of the measure, and I do so with greater confidence because I noticed the other day that in another place a very high legal authority, no less a personage than the present Attorney General, when it was suggested to him that the wording of this particular Bill compared with the legislation of the country generally was rather difficult to interpret, pointed out that he himself found great difficulty in understanding the statutes, and that when he did so he invariably referred to a text-book on the subject, and he confidently recommended such a course to those who asked him questions on the subject. Now, I find in a text-book that is very generally accepted this passage—

> "The words, 'the inherent capabilities of the soil' may mean anything or they may mean nothing."

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: Would the noble Lord tell us what the text-book is?

LORD BURGHCLERE: It is the "Law of Agricultural Holdings," by Sylvain Mayer; it is a well-known book, in general use. If that be a true definition, and if the source to which we were recommended to address ourselves for information by the Attorney General is a competent source, I can hardly think that there would be any noble Lord who would wish to retain on the Statute-book a phrase of such comprehensive uncertainty as the one to which I refer. My Lords, there is an observation I should like to make about one feature of the Bill which was not alluded to by the noble Lord who introduced it. This Bill is in the main a permissive Bill, and the principle of contracting out is maintained in the Bill throughout. Of course I know that there are in many portions of this country highly desirable and advantageous customs which are called the customs of the country, and by making this Bill a purely permissive Bill those customs are maintained in their entirety, and so far I should think it would have the approbation of many noble Lords who understand the subject. But on the other hand I am bound, in justice to the advocates of the Bill, as well as to those who oppose it, to point out to the Government that if the principle of arbitration and the alterations in the principle of arbitration which have been made in this Bill are advantageous and for the good of the country generally, it is a curious thing that they should not be made universal and even compulsory when questions of this nature arise between landlord and tenant. I think it might be alleged by some critics of the

Bill that this would be advantageous possibly to the poorer and smaller tenants as compared with the larger ones, because it is quite obvious that a rich and well-to-do man is much more able to make good terms for himself than one who is poorer and in a different position. However, the Government have not seen their way to make it other than permissive, and therefore the Act will no doubt go on the Statute-book as a permissive Act and a permissive Act alone. The next remark I shall venture to make on the Bill is in regard to the complications, and I am afraid I must call it the bad drafting which has arisen from the abrupt and I would almost say the not very well-considered attempt to combine Scotch and English legislation in the same Bill. As your Lordships are aware, hitherto without exception there have been separate Acts relating to these matters for England and for Scotland. I venture to think that that course has been adopted not without some sufficient reason; because, if you consider it, the methods of cultivation, the relations of landlords and tenants in many parts of the country, and even the very legal expressions by which those relations are defined in the Statute-book, are often completely different in the two countries, and I therefore think it would have been better, on the whole, perhaps, to have conformed to what has been the universal precedent, and to have brought forward a separate measure for Scotland, in order to amend the separate Scotch Acts, rather than what has been done in this instance by, I venture to think, the somewhat hasty attempt to combine the two Acts, laying the seeds, it may be, of some considerable confusion when the working out of the Act takes place. I would venture to illustrate what I mean by one instance. As the noble Lord pointed out just now, in Part III. of the schedule to the Bill, which contains those improvements which may be made without any consent of the landlord whatever, we find a new one—No. 28, "laying down temporary pasture." Now, I am told—I speak with all submission, and I shall probably be corrected if I am wrong—that in some portions of Scotland, perhaps in Aberdeenshire, temporary pasture is merely one in the ordinary rotation in the crops of that country; whereas, in the South of England, temporary pasture may be well maintained to be an improvement on the holding. Therefore it will come about by this Bill that what is in Scotland merely the ordinary course of good husbandry is in another part of the country made into a tenant's improvement, for which he might claim compensation from the landlord. If that proposition be true, I think I have shown one, at least, of the disadvantages of departing from precedent, and endeavouring to combine the Scotch and English Bills into the same measure. My Lords, that reflection naturally leads me to another criticism which I shall venture to make—namely, with regard to the general drafting of the Bill. I think it will be generally admitted that it is better that every measure should as far as possible be couched in plain and understandable language that may be more or less understood by the ordinary layman, and that is, perhaps, more essential in these highly technical measures which refer to the relations of landlord and tenant, and I think it would be desirable that the Bill should be made as far as possible able to be understood by the agricultural interest itself. The measure should be set forth as far as possible in clear and reasonable terms. Now, I ask whether that is the case in this "small amending Bill," which has just been brought in? I will venture to read one of the clauses in the Bill, and I shall be glad if any ordinary mortal can put any understanding to it at all. Let me read to your Lordships Clause 10—

"(1) References to the principal Act and to Sections 29, 30, 32, and 34 thereof shall be construed as references to the Agricultural Holdings (Scotland) Act, 1883, and to Sections 24, 26, 25, and 30 thereof respectively. References to Sections 31 and 39 of the principal Act shall not apply.

"(2) A reference to the Arbitration Act, 1889, shall be construed as a reference to the Arbitration (Scotland) Act, 1894, and a reference to the Market Gardeners' Compensation Act, 1895, shall be construed as a reference to the Market Gardeners' Compensation (Scotland) Act, 1897."

Now, I ask noble Lords generally whether that is a clause which is understandable by the ordinary intellect, and whether it would not require a very considerable knowledge of the statutes of the country, to say nothing of some rather distinguished legal knowledge, to be able to make out what on earth is meant by the clause which is put before us? My Lords, I know I shall be told that this is merely

the ordinary sin of legislation by reference, and it has often been pointed out, and I think truly pointed out, that legislation by reference has its advantages in that it is possible in a highly complicated measure to avoid undue discussion on the subject and undue Amendments which may be drafted at a moment's notice without any serious study of the Bill. That may be so, and this method may have its advantages, but I cannot help thinking that, notwithstanding that, this is a course which is doing evil that good may come. But I have a very humble suggestion to make on the subject to Her Majesty's Government. We were told by the Minister for Agriculture in another place that it is intended to consolidate these Acts in another session. The objections which I have pointed out and the advantages which are gained by legislation by reference do not so much apply to a consolidating Bill, because we all know that in a consolidating Bill no new principle is allowed to come in, and therefore there cannot be the same discussion. Now I would suggest to the Government whether it would not be possible, when this consolidating Bill is brought in, not to legislate by reference, but to embody in the principle of the consolidating measure those clauses which would make it understandable by the common intellect. If that were carried out I think it would be doing something which would be of advantage, especially to the agricultural interest. There is only one general observation which occurs to me, and it shall be a very brief one, with regard to the agricultural legislation of the present Government. The remedial legislation of the present Government consists, I think, mainly of two Bills. One is the Agricultural Rating Act, and the other is the measure which we are considering to-day. That, as I understand it, is the sum total of the remedial legislation which Her Majesty's Government have found themselves able to bring in during their lease of power. My Lords, that is a very remarkable fact, well worth the consideration of the agricultural interest. I say this, I assure noble Lords opposite, in no polemical spirit. No one is more confident than I am that the Government are most anxious to bring in, and those who support the Government in both Houses of Parliament would be most anxious to support them in bringing in, any measures which could in any way assist or alleviate agricultural depression or agricultural distress. But it is a remarkable fact, as I have ventured to point out, that after five years of considerable power and a great majority, the most that they are capable of producing —I give noble Lords opposite credit for the intention sincerely to carry out their promises—but the only thing that they have been able to do is to pass the Rating Act and this "small amending measure." I am sure that no one can be more surprised than are Her Majesty's Government at such a result of their labours, because that was obviously not their intention when they sought and when they accepted office. I very well remember in another place during the three years that the late Government was in power, year after year, session after session, Queen's Speech after Queen's Speech, we were reproached and we were twitted on every side because we neglected the agricultural interest and failed to help it by bringing in remedial legislation. We were told that legislation of this nature was instantly and immediately desired. We were told that during 1892 and 1895. We were told that by very eminent members of the present Government during the General Election of 1895, and even the Commission of Inquiry which we ourselves proposed at that time in order to see whether it was possible to carry out any legislative action in the matter—even that was criticised and condemned, because it was said so instant was the need for remedial legislation that even that Commission was dilatory and unnecessary. I may point out, because I have some interest in that Commission, that notwithstanding that, the Commission has been of the highest possible utility to the present Government, because it is by the Reports of that Commission and by the influence of that Commission that the only two Acts of an agricultural nature which have been brought forward have been suggested and have been adopted by the Government at the present day. But, however, whether that be so or not, and I really do not want to enter into any polemical discussion on the subject—I merely refer to it as a general remark—I say it is most remarkable that after five years, after all the consideration which I have no doubt has been given to it, the only remedial legislation which it has been possible to carry through by the present powerful

Government is a Rating Act about which great differences of opinion exist in many parts of the country, and this measure, which has been termed by one of the Government's own supporters a "small amending Bill." Finally, my Lords, I must add that I am afraid there will be considerable disappointment in some quarters that this long-expected Bill goes no farther than it does. I do not myself hold any very wildly advanced ideas on questions of land tenure, but I cannot help thinking that even the most moderate-minded agriculturist had been led to expect a somewhat larger measure of reform than that which is offered to us in the measure which has been introduced by the noble Viscount to-night. I know many agriculturists who have often told me that they did not expect at any time any possible benefit to them by any possible alteration of the Agricultural Holdings Act at all, but even these gentlemen I think—after a measure has been talked about, promised in Queen's Speech after Queen's Speech, talked about on the platform, written about in the press—even such moderate-minded gentlemen must have had their hopes raised and expectations aroused, and I consequently fear that there may be some disappointment when the measure that has been introduced to-night comes to be thoroughly understood. However, my Lords, although this measure in many ways does not do what many agriculturists I dare say expected it was going to do, yet, as I have pointed out, it does contain some provisions which undoubtedly will be of benefit to the agricultural classes at large, especially in the matter of establishing arbitration between landlord and tenant. That in itself is a very laudable object, and for my part I venture to welcome the measure that the noble Viscount has introduced.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: My Lords, I am sure that so far as the principle upon which this Bill is founded there will be no difference of opinion in the House. I am sure that everyone wishes to be perfectly just in any legislation which concerns the relations between landlord and tenant. On the other hand, my noble friend who has just sat down alluded in rather dark terms to certain possible benefits which certain people are expecting or were expecting to derive from any agricultural legislation. What those benefits may have been he did not go on to tell us, but according to the line of argument with which he ended his speech, in which there was a reference to the benefits granted by the late Government as compared with those granted by the present Government——

LORD BURGHCLERE: I beg my noble friend's pardon. I made no reference to any benefits conferred by the late Government.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: I thought the noble Lord said that there were certain proposals made during the tenure of office of the late Government.

LORD BURGHCLERE: No; I made no reference of the kind.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: Then I beg my noble friend's pardon. At any rate, he threw out certain innuendoes that the present Government had not done what might have been expected from them on behalf of the agricultural classes. Well, my Lords, I do not propose to enter into that part of the argument; I do not think it is necessary. What we are dealing with to-night is the Second Reading of this Bill, and it is to the principle of the Bill and to the contents of the Bill that I propose to address the few sentences which I have to say to your Lordships. As I said before, with the principle that it is desirable to be perfectly just in any legislation between landlord and tenant, I am sure we are all agreed. When I say the Bill is founded on that principle, it is quite true, as the noble Viscount who introduced it said, that in reality it is a Bill made up of a multiplicity of details rather than a Bill that states a principle which is supposed to have been admitted. Therefore, in considering the Bill, I propose very shortly to follow the example of the noble Viscount, and to go through one or two clauses, more with a view of obtaining information than anything else, which no doubt at a later stage of the Bill will be discussed in considerable detail. On the first clause, which defines the value of an improvement and says it is "such sum as fairly represents the value of the improvement to an incoming tenant," the noble Viscount pointed out to us quite properly that an alteration has been made in this Bill as compared with the existing law, and that that alteration

consists in omitting the words which refer to the inherent capabilities of the soil. Those words "the inherent capabilities of the soil," it may be as well to remind your Lordships, were the subject of an Amendment which was very fully discussed in the House of Commons in 1883. The value of that Amendment was not admitted by the proposers only, but it was assented to and agreed to by noble Lords on both sides of the House, including the late Lord Herschell, who said that he considered it was necessary and desirable, and in the end it was inserted in the Act with the full concurrence and consent of all parties concerned. This Bill proposes to omit these words. Now with regard to the exact value of the words themselves I do not propose to say much. The noble Lord quoted to us just now a text-book, which he says is a very good one, in which it is stated that those words have no value at all. It has been stated elsewhere that as a matter of fact valuators never took them into account when making an award under the Act, and that has been given as a reason, and the only reason that I have seen forcibly put forward, why it was desirable and possible without doing any injury to omit those words from this Bill. But one must remember that this section is going to be interpreted not by the writer of any text-book, not even by the judges; it is going to be interpreted, in the absence of agreement, by arbitrators appointed by the Board of Agriculture. What I should like to know is this. I do not myself attach any very great importance to the words. If it were now proposed for the first time to put them in I do not know what I might have said or thought about them; but what I want to know now is, what is the effect of omitting those words in this Act which were expressly put in and were supposed and believed to have some considerable value? Supposing that judges were going to interpret this Act, for instance, which they are not, would they or would they not attach any importance to the distinct omission of a proviso of this kind? That is really the whole point. These words may have value or they may not have, but they are to be decided upon by the arbitrators. Now who are the arbitrators likely to be? They are likely to be men, I should suppose, probably of some practical acquaintance with land for this purpose—men who are not as a rule very skilful judges of legal phraseology. I should certainly like to hear from some legal authority what they would say in a similar case; but is it not likely that an arbitrator would say, "These words which were very much insisted upon and very much objected to by people outside the House have been struck out by Parliament. It cannot be supposed when Parliament was striking the words out that Parliament meant to do nothing at all; it struck them out on purpose, and it is quite clear that Parliament intended to transfer to the tenant something which was refused to him by the law as it stood up to that time." My Lords, I have nothing at this point to say upon that matter further than that I should like to know what, in the opinion of the noble Viscount, and, what is of still greater importance, the opinion of the noble Lord on the Woolsack, is the effect which naturally may be expected to flow from the omission of these words under the conditions which I have named. There are no other matters in the first clause which I think it is necessary to refer to, except that in Sub-section 5 it is said—

"Nothing in this section shall prejudice the right of a tenant to claim any compensation to which he may be entitled under custom, agreement, or otherwise."

My Lords, I rather gathered from the noble Lord who spoke last that he himself thought it might have been advisable to make a Bill of this sort compulsory. Fortunately for the good management and easy management of land in this country, I believe that the bulk of the business will be done, as it has been done, by custom and by private agreement, which is so well understood and which is different in different parts of the country, and not by laws which have been framed by the House of Commons and by this House. Your Lordships know, just as I do, that it is impossible to put into words many of the relations and transactions and duties which are incumbent upon a landlord in dealing with a tenant, and *vice versa*. There is so much depends on individuals, so much depends on the country, so much depends on the soil, so much depends on the practice, that custom and agreement must always be superior to the law, and I hope that Parliament will never be so unwise—it never has been hitherto, and I hope it never will be—as to attempt to determine the relations between landlord and tenant.

In the second sub-section it is stated that—

"Any claim by a tenant for compensation under the principal Act or this Act in respect of any improvement comprised in the first schedule to this Act shall not be made after the determination of the tenancy."

As your Lordships know, at the present time the date in Scotland is four months before the expiration of the tenancy. In England I believe it is two months. I may say that I think this change is a good change. As the Bill originally stood it proposed to give a tenant some time after the expiration of the tenancy—an arrangement which would have produced, no doubt, very great confusion; but as the Bill stands it seems to me that you have done what is very fair and right in allowing the tenant to make his claim at any time before he leaves. The proposal in regard to there being a single arbitrator I imagine will obtain general approval. We all wish to do anything which will cheapen the procedure, and although, of course, we shall run the risk of the proceedings being before an arbitrator who is not a skilled lawyer, and who would labour, therefore, under certain disadvantages in interpreting contracts—although we may labour under certain disadvantages, yet on the whole, and taking the probable outcome from the clause, I think the single arbitrator is preferable, and the doing away with the court of appeal is, on the whole, an advisable course for the Government to have taken. My Lords, I do not think I need trouble your Lordships with anything further until we come to Clause 6, but to that clause I should like to call your Lordships' attention. It says—

"Notwithstanding any provision in a contract of tenancy for the payment by the tenant of an increased rent or other liquidated damages for a breach of a covenant or condition, a landlord shall not be entitled to recover, by distress or otherwise, any sum in respect of a breach of any such covenant or condition in excess of the damage actually suffered by him."

And it goes on with the proviso—

"That this section shall not apply to any covenant or condition against breaking up permanent pasture, grubbing underwoods, or felling, cutting, lopping or injuring trees."

It seems to me that that proviso proclaims the futility of the clause. Unless there be something contrary to public policy, is it not desirable that a landlord and tenant should be left to make any arrangements between themselves they may choose? Personally I have no love for penal clauses, but I do not see any reason—and surely some reason should be given—why even a landlord or a tenant may not propose and may not make and may not enforce any covenant which they choose. If it could be shown that it was contrary to public policy, and that public or general damage would ensue from that course, then I could understand Parliament forbidding what have been called penal rents; but, on the other hand, you will see in the clause as it stands you limit the damage which the landlord can recover to the damage which he actually sustains. If the clause stood by itself pure and simple every one of your Lordships knows that there are damages which you could not compensate in money. The Government originally proposed to compensate in money for breaking up permanent pasture. It would be perfectly impossible to assess that damage in money. No one can say what it is. It is entirely different in different places. As the noble Lord who spoke just now said, in some parts of Scotland nothing is easier or commoner than to sow down land to seeds and clover, and you get your clover, and the land will stand for several years in grass, and very good grass it is. If you try to do that in some of the strong land in the south of England no pasture comes at all after the first year or so. If the Government had not inserted this proviso and made it apply to permanent pasture, one would have been able to give them an instance in which the clause would have been absolutely injurious and absolutely unfair; and, so far as I can see, when you apply it to permanent pasture or any similar case, nothing can be fairer than that the landlord who wishes not to obtain payment for the damage done, but to prevent any possibility of the damage being done, should be able to say that if a person took a particular course he should be liable to pay a sum which would be sufficient in amount to prevent any likelihood of the act which it is wished to prevent being done. As I say, personally, looking at it as a purely practical matter, one can find no very great objection to it, but in dealing with it as a principle of law surely nothing can be more undesirable than that Parliament should interfere with the right of contract between landlord and tenant, unless there is some posi-

tive public reason for so doing. The noble Lord who spoke last made some strictures—and, I thought, very deserved strictures—on the extraordinary phraseology of Clause 10. I do not think I can agree with him altogether in blaming the Government for making the Act applicable both to Scotland and to England. It is desirable to do so if you can do it, and on the whole, having some little knowledge of one part of the country, a part in which there is a good deal of high farming, I have been looking into the clauses, and I may say that I have not been able to see any particular objection to them. I quite admit this—I do not understand them; and I do not think that any other person in this House, or any other Scotchman, possibly could understand them, because they consist simply of references, and I do not think anyone has either the time or the intelligence, and I think probably he is not intended to have either the time or the intelligence, to make himself fully acquainted with their contents; but that is the system which draughtsmen have adopted—some of us think, very deliberately adopted. It has been said before now that this new mode of drafting has been adopted for the purpose of getting Bills through another place, and possibly through this House. I have known recently of cases in which noble Lords have been very much surprised to see things which have happened, and they have been very angry on ascertaining what a particular Bill really meant. Now, my Lords, I come to the schedules. In Part II. of the schedules there are, as the noble Viscount pointed out, some improvements in respect of which notice to the landlord is now to be sufficient where his consent was formerly required. Those matters are the making of gardens, the planting of orchards or fruit bushes, and the making and planting of osier beds. Except in certain rare cases—I believe they are very rare—I do not think it very much matters, because it will not be found very often that the tenants will make gardens or plant orchards or osier beds. They will usually choose to go to their landlords for fruit bushes if they want them, and so far as the making and planting of osier beds is concerned, I dare say they may do that in some places, but those places must be very few. What I want to call attention to is the principle which is involved in this second part of the schedule as amended. The ordinary principle on which a holding is held in England and Scotland has been hitherto, as I understand it, this: that the landlord, executing all or very nearly all the permanent improvements, making the fences, the buildings, and all things of that kind, and having, in fact, the full control of the holding, has hitherto had a right to say for what purpose his holding shall be used, and he has had a right to object if that holding was going to be applied to some purpose other than the purpose for which he let it. Now, what does the clause do? It says that, beyond one acre, no man may make a garden or do any of these other things without the consent of his landlord; but when you get below an acre then anyone may make a garden, plant an orchard, or make an osier bed, and he is to be entitled to be compensated for that. If it is a market garden, he is to come under the provisions of Part III., which refers to market gardens. Well, suppose he has made one garden, and suppose he leaves the holding — the tenant, generally speaking, holds on a yearly tenancy — then the next man comes; is he to be entitled to the same thing over again? How many times may it be done? Is there anything in the Bill to restrict the number of times it may be done? It seems to me that this involves a principle which is very much larger than the mere words or the mere effect which the clause is likely to have. I have no doubt that that will be a matter which will be discussed hereafter. I must apologise to your Lordships for having detained you so long. I do not think it is necessary for me to trouble your Lordships any further.

LORD DE RAMSEY: My Lords, there are two matters upon which I wish to address the House, very shortly indeed, and they have arisen out of the two speeches that we have just heard. The noble Lord on the front Opposition bench made a statement which certainly was not very germane to the Second Reading of the Bill, but it was a statement which I can hardly allow to go uncontradicted. He says that the present Government have only passed two Bills which really have aided the agricultural interest. The noble Lord has forgotten one measure passed by the present Government,

and a most useful measure—namely, the reduction of the land tax to a maximum of one shilling. That measure has brought infinite relief to a great many of those who have been struggling with agricultural depression; but apart from that, if there had not been a single measure of any description passed for the relief of agriculture, I maintain that the firm attitude which has been adopted by our Minister for Agriculture in successfully withstanding all insidious appeals that might have led to the introduction of foot-and-mouth disease and swine fever into this country, has done more good than any legislation that could possibly have been introduced. The other matter I wish to say a word or two upon has been touched upon by the noble Earl opposite, and that is the question of the omission of these words, "the inherent capabilities of the soil." I am well aware that the noble Viscount who introduced this Bill has got, as usual, a Royal Commission at his back, but I do maintain that if Parliament deliberately omits those words that have been in a previous Act people will naturally say, "Well, Parliament did not think it necessary to insert them." And apart from that, in the ordinary industry of agriculture, I submit to your Lordships that a most important element is the inherent capabilities of the soil. Lastly, I touch upon a matter which has been mentioned by both noble Lords, and that is the extraordinary drafting of this Bill. For years we have been engaged in trying to spread the land amongst the smaller people in this kingdom. We have had allotments, we have had small holdings, we are trying small farms, we are doing what we can to enlarge the number of tenants. Will any noble Lord tell me how it is possible, in three-fourths of a sheet of a Bill of this kind, to explain to any of these small men how he stands in relation to this matter? I know it cannot probably be done in this Bill, but I appeal to the noble Viscount, if he is again, as I hope he will be, in a position to help us in the agricultural world, that he will simplify the procedure.

On Question, agreed to. Bill read 2ª accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the whole House on Friday next.

LUNACY BOARD (SCOTLAND) (SALARIES, ETC.) BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

*THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Lord BALFOUR of BURLEIGH): This Bill is a very simple one. The Lunacy Board for Scotland has been established for about half a century, and at the time it was established a limit was put on the salaries which the Treasury might pay to the officers engaged by the Board. Since that time the scale of payment has risen. The limit of the secretary's salary, which is £420, is certainly inadequate, and the object of this Bill is simply to repeal the maximum salaries, and to leave these civil servants in the position of nearly all other civil servants in the various departments of the Crown, and to give power to the Treasury to fix a proper scale of remuneration. I ask your Lordships to give a Second Reading to the Bill.

Bill read 2ª (according to Order), and committed to a Committee of the whole House on Thursday next.

INEBRIATES' AMENDMENT (SCOTLAND) BILL [H.L.].

Commons Amendment considered (according to Order), and agreed to.

EXECUTORS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

House in Committee (according to Order); an Amendment made; Bill recommitted to the Standing Committee; and to be printed as amended. (No. 194.)

BEER RETAILERS' AND SPIRIT GROCERS' LICENCES (IRELAND) (No. 2) BILL.

Read 3ª (according to Order), with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

PROHIBITION OF EXPORTATION OF ARMS BILL [H.L.].

House in Committee (according to Order); Bill reported without amendment; Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3ª on Thursday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS OFFICES.

Second Report from the Select Committee considered.

THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (The Earl of MORLEY) moved "That the House do agree with the said Report."

*LORD TWEEDMOUTH: My Lords, I want to say a very few words upon the last paragraph of this Report, which says that after considering the letter addressed to the Clerk of Parliaments by the Clerk Assistant and certain proposals made by the Lord Chancellor, it was resolved—

"That the Committee, having heard the proposals of the Lord Chancellor, have no recommendation to make to the House."

Now, my Lords, though perhaps it is very discreet of the Committee to have come to this conclusion, I do not think it really represents the mind that was in the minds of members of the Committee. I think I am not misrepresenting the views of large bulk of the Committee if I say the that they were very strongly inclined to the view that the recommendation of the Committee of 1889 was a very reasonable recommendation, and one that it was in the interest of the House to have carried out. The whole question, of course, refers to the appointment of a Reading Clerk to fill the third seat that has been so long vacant at the Table of your Lordships' House. The subject has not been a new one before the House of Lords Offices Committee, and, indeed, if I am not misinformed, it has been much discussed by even a more august body. The facts are these: Prior to the year 1824 the appointment of the Assistant Clerk and of the Reading Clerk was in the hands of the Clerk of Parliaments. It was then transferred to the Lord Chancellor, and since then the Lord Chancellor has had the exercise of the patronage of the two seats at the Table. It has been realised of recent years that the sittings of your Lordships' House are not usually very prolonged, and that therefore the actual work in the House that the Reading Clerk has had to do has not been excessive, and at any rate is not such as to require the full time that a competent man could give to the work. At the same time I think it has been brought very clearly before the House of Lords Offices Committee, both recently during the present session and also on former occasions, that it is desirable that there should be a third clerk at the Table; that great inconvenience might occur through one of the other two clerks being absent, and that though the absolute work of the Reading Clerk is not very great, yet he is able during the sittings of the House to give great help in other respects to the other two clerks, and that really it is in the interests of the House that a third clerk should be sitting at the Table. Now the difficulty is this, that you have got a certain amount of work, not a great deal of work, but yet work that it requires an experienced man to perform, and a man who is acquainted with the procedure and Standing Orders of the House. The Committee has, on more than one occasion, held the opinion that such a man could be found amongst the higher clerks already in the service of your Lordships' House, and that it was a very reasonable and convenient arrangement that one of the higher clerks of the House should have added to his duties the duties of the Reading Clerk at the Table. In the year 1889 the Committee reported, and your Lordships' House adopted the Report—

"The Clerk Assistant and the Reading Clerk were formerly appointed by the Clerk of Parliaments. Since 1824 the Lord Chanellor has appointed these offices. The Committee strongly recommend that the appointment of at least one of these clerkships should revert to the Clerk of Parliaments, and that he should promote one of the senior clerks of his department whom he shall consider most fit for the post. The clerk could combine with his duties at the Table the office of chief clerk or headship of a department. This change would, in the opinion of the Committee, conduce to efficiency no less than economy."

Owing to the unfortunate vacancy that took place in the Reading Clerk's appointment, this question came again this session for consideration before the Committee. I think the Committee's opinion, though not expressed, was, after all, very much in accordance with the resolution of 1889; and in the Committee I ventured to move the reassertion of that resolution. Some conversation ensued, and eventually the noble and learned Earl who sits on the Woolsack suggested that the whole matter might be referred to a Sub-committee of the Committee, consisting of the very eminent Peers, Lord Salisbury, Lord Kimberley, and the Duke of Devonshire. In face of that proposal, on the advice of the Lord Chairman, I withdrew my proposal. These noble Lords met. I understand that the Leader on that Bench and the Leader on this Bench agreed to leave the whole decision of the matter to the Duke of Devonshire, who now sits on the Front Bench. Well,

the noble Duke, I am afraid, did not give the Committee any very great assistance by the recommendation that he made, because, so far as I am able to understand it, all the noble Duke decided was that the Lord Chancellor had the most complete right to appoint whom he liked.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (The Earl of HALSBURY): That is not quite an accurate statement of what occurred.

LORD TWEEDMOUTH: That was the impression left on the minds of many of us. We received no formal report, and that was the idea left in my mind, at any rate. That, of course, was a power not in the least in dispute, and we most gladly assent to the fact that the power does lie with the Lord Chancellor to appoint whom he chooses. Now, unfortunately, I think rather a personal tone has been given to this question. I am very sorry for it, because I am sure that the very last thought that is the minds of any of us is to cast any reflection whatever on the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack, and that all we are anxious to do is in the most friendly and considerate way simply to represent to him what our views are. After the Committee sat, the noble and learned Earl then suggested to the Committee that he was quite ready to appoint one of the senior clerks on this occasion to the seat at the Table, which is now vacant, on condition that a Bill should be brought into Parliament for the future transferring the appointment to the Clerk of Parliaments with the further condition that whoever the Clerk of Parliaments should appoint should be a lawyer. Well, that was giving a very new and somewhat unexpected turn to the discussion, because we had not up to that time been informed that the legal service of your Lordships' House had been inefficiently performed under existing arrangements. My Lords, further, I have to point out that when the position of Assistant Clerk was vacant not very long ago, and when the Lord Chancellor made, as we all know, the most excellent appointment in the person of the gentleman who now occupies that position, the noble and learned Lord did not choose a lawyer for that position. Therefore at that time it would seem that there was no great necessity for a further appointment in the legal division; but I must say I think the noble Earl on the Woolsack rather gave his own case away in saying that on this occasion he was prepared to appoint to the seat here the clerk now in the service of your Lordships' House. It seems to me that by offering to do that—and I quite accept and welcome the concession that was made to our views in that offer—yet in making that offer surely the noble and learned Earl did give away his case of the extreme necessity of further legal assistance in respect of the clerks at the Table. As I say, I repudiate any idea of any personal reflection. I am only anxious to see this matter settled in a manner which will be conducive to the efficiency of the service of the House, and also which will prevent any ill-feeling arising between this House and the other House of Parliament. I do hold that we are bound so far as we can to combine economy with efficiency, to endeavour as far as possible to meet the views that have been again and again expressed by the other House, which have also been insisted upon by the Executive, by the Treasury, that as far as possible economy should be exercised with regard to our appointments. I propose to move, as an addition to the motion that this Report be adopted, the following words—

"But this House is of opinion that the appointment of Reading Clerk should revert to the Clerk of Parliaments, and that he should promote one of the senior clerks of his Department whom he shall consider most fit for the purpose."

That is taking practically the words of the recommendation which your Lordships adopted in 1889, applying it only to the Reading Clerk, and I think it is one which your Lordships would do well to accept. It would not at all fetter the action of the noble and learned Earl on the Woolsack, who would be perfectly free to appoint whom he liked; but I hope that were such a resolution carried, the noble Earl would be willing to assent to the wish so expressed—a wish expressed, I can assure him, with every desire to recognise his great abilities and the admirable manner in which he has always discharged his duties in this House.

THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (The Duke of DEVONSHIRE): I do not know whether the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack will think it necessary to make any explanation or reply to the speech

delivered by the noble Lord opposite. I only rise for the purpose of explaining the very small part which I have had in the matter to which the noble Lord has referred. With regard to the motion which the noble Lord has announced his intention of moving, it seems to me it would be a very inconvenient proceeding that such a motion as this should be moved without any notice whatever having been previously given. The House is scarcely in a condition to pronounce a decision on this subject, which has come before the greater part of those Members of the House who are present in an entirely unexpected manner. With regard to the noble Lord's statement, however, my part in this matter has been simply this. I will state it as clearly as I can, although, not knowing that this matter was coming on, I have not the correspondence to which I should have liked to be able to refer. I was not present at the meeting of the Offices Committee when the consideration of the question was delegated, as has been stated by the noble Lord, to the noble Earl opposite and the Prime Minister and myself; but what I understood was that the reference to that sub-committee was to consider what advice should be given to the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack in the matter. That was the question which I think at the only time we met was to a certain extent discussed. As has been stated, however, the noble Earl opposite and the Prime Minister agreed to delegate their functions to me, and I proceeded—I admit after some interval—to consider as well as I could how I was to discharge this rather difficult duty, and what advice I should suggest should be given to the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack. After some conversation with the noble and learned Lord and others, I came to the conclusion that although it was perfectly true that the duties of the Reading Clerk at this Table are not extremely arduous, and could be performed by some other clerk in the Parliamentary offices, who would discharge other duties, yet some inconvenience was considered by the noble and learned Lord to exist through the absence, in what I believe is called the judicial department of those offices, of any official possessing the acquirements of a trained lawyer; and the noble and learned Lord considered that in the discharge of its duties as the highest court of appeal, it would be of great advantage that such assistance should be provided to the House. What I understood the noble and learned Lord proposed to do if he made the appointment was to appoint a qualified barrister, whose time certainly would not be wholly occupied by his duties at this Table, but whose services would be available for the judicial department of the offices. I therefore informed the Prime Minister and the noble Earl opposite that, as there was no question of the right to the appointment belonging to the noble and learned Lord, he might be advised to exercise his right if he was prepared to do so, having regard to the necessity of additional legal assistance on the part of the House. The noble and learned Lord, I believe, saw the letter in which I communicated to the Prime Minister that opinion of mine. He did not act directly upon it in making the appointment, as I suggested he might do, but he made the proposal which has been stated by the noble Lord. As to that proposal of the noble and learned Lord, I have nothing to say. I merely wanted to state exactly the nature of the part which I took in the matter, which was simply to advise that if the noble and learned Lord thought that the judicial business of the House required additional legal assistance he would be perfectly justified in exercising his right to make this appointment.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: My Lords, as I was deputed, in conjunction with the noble Duke opposite and the Prime Minister, to consider this question, I feel bound to say a few words. In the first place, the whole of what the noble Duke has stated appears to me to be perfectly and entirely accurate. It is a matter of fact that when we met Lord Salisbury suggested to me that inasmuch as the noble Duke was the only one of us three who had not taken some part in the matter before, and therefore was not in any way pledged to certain views, it would be convenient, as we had a colleague in the noble Duke who had had nothing to do with the matter before, that we should refer the matter to him to give us his advice. You have heard what was the result. Now I will state my own view. In the first place, I was, with Lord Salisbury, a member of a sub-committee in the year 1889 which considered very carefully indeed the whole question of the officers of the House, especially with reference to

the very unpleasant disputes which had been going on with the Treasury, and which had found their echo in the other House, as to the want of economy in these appointments. We recommended to the Committee of Black Rod a variety of changes, all of which, I believe, have been carried into effect, and which, I believe, have in no way impaired the efficiency of the House, and have conduced to very considerable economy. Amongst other changes we suggested that the appointment which is by law vested in the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack should in future, if the Lord Chancellor would consent, be transferred to the Clerk of Parliaments, and that the post of Reading Clerk should be combined with the duties of one of the general establishment. That certainly seemed to me at the time a very reasonable proposal. The Lord Chancellor, who undoubtedly possesses the power by Act of Parliament to make the appointment of Reading Clerk, did pursue that course upon the occasion of the vacancy then occurring; but when another vacancy occurred a difficulty arose, and that is the difficulty we are now considering. Certainly my opinion as to the advantages of the change which was recommended by the Committee which sat in 1889 has never changed, except upon this point, which I wish to explain exactly. When we came to consider the point which was referred to the noble Duke and the noble Marquess and myself, we learnt from the noble Duke that after consulting with the Lord Chancellor he had to tell us that the Lord Chancellor was of the opinion that there was not sufficient assistance to the House in the discharge of its very important duties as a Court of Appeal, and that it would be very desirable that the post of Reading Clerk should be held by a trained lawyer. We had the advantage on the Committee of hearing the opinions of the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack, and if I understood him rightly he based his view upon this—of which, as it seems to me, he is by far the best judge—that with the amount of business which now comes before the House as a Court of Appeal, and looking to the whole conduct of that business, he had satisfied himself that it was desirable for the proper conduct of that very important branch of the business of this House that a trained lawyer should be appointed who should combine with his duties in the House as a Court of Appeal the duty of Reading Clerk. I would just repeat that I entirely agree with the noble Duke that it has been shown that, although there is not sufficient work to be done by the Reading Clerk to occupy the whole of his time, it would be extremely inconvenient to the House that there should not be a third clerk. That, I think, must be very obvious. Our clerks may, like the rest of us, be for a time subject to be absent from illness, and it is obvious that extreme inconvenience might result to the business of the House if there were not a third clerk to take the place of one of the other gentlemen during temporary absence. But, at the same time, it is also perfectly clear that there is not sufficient business attached to the office of the Reading Clerk to occupy the full time of a competent person. Then when the Lord Chancellor, who, of course is, above all men in this House, competent to judge what is necessary for the service of the House as regards the discharge of its duty as a Court of Appeal—when the Lord Chancellor states that he has satisfied himself that it was necessary for the proper discharge of those duties that there should be a trained lawyer appointed, then my advice to the Committee was this: Here is a matter of which the Lord Chancellor is above all the best judge. If he informs this House upon his responsibility and with his knowledge that it is desirable, nay more, that it is necessary, for the discharge of the business of the House as a Court of Appeal, that a trained lawyer should be appointed, and that that trained lawyer in his opinion may also properly discharge the duties of Reading Clerk, it seemed to me that it was beyond my competence to oppose the Lord Chancellor in taking the course which he thought necessary to provide the House with proper assistance. But as I have personally no knowledge of the Court of Appeal, as I am not myself in any way qualified to judge of the assistance the Court of Appeal may require, I considered that it should be left to the Lord Chancellor upon his responsibility to exercise his statutory power to appoint a clerk, who would also discharge the duties of Reading Clerk. Beyond that I was not disposed to go, and I informed the noble Duke that I practically concurred in his view after full consideration, and I also suggested to the

Committee that, the state of affairs having been now for a very long time in suspense, it was not desirable that the dispute which had arisen should be pursued further—that although the Committee might some of them have the opinion that the arrangement which was originally proposed was the best one, it was much better for them to leave the Lord Chancellor to take the course which to him seemed to be best, and that therefore we should abstain from expressing any further opinion. That, my Lords, is a complete account of the part I took in this matter, and I have nothing to add except this, that never in the whole course of the business have I had the smallest wish or desire or reason to attribute any evil motives to the Lord Chancellor, or to find fault with any view he may hold if he holds it on his own judgment and responsibility.

*The Earl of MORLEY: My Lords, I was not aware that there was to be a discussion upon this matter to-night, but as I was Chairman of the Committee I can hardly allow the debate to pass without saying a very few words on the subject. I very much agree with what the noble Lord (Lord Kimberley) said in his last remarks. I certainly have not the means of judging what is required for the discharge of the duties connected with this House as a Court of Appeal, and I quite agree with the noble Earl that there is nobody in this House so capable of judging of those requirements as the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack. But I do want to lay very great stress upon this, that if an extra officer is required for the Court of Appeal he should be appointed by the Lord Chancellor himself on his own responsibility, and that there should be no transfer to the Clerk of Parliaments or anyone else any patronage connected with that appointment. That I feel very strongly indeed. I always understood that the Clerk of Parliaments, who is a trained lawyer, was a Registrar of the High Court, and that the clerical duties connected with the judicial business were performed by Clerks of the House, who had done their work with ability and with great industry. The late Mr. de Burgh was a very able head of the Judicial department, and I was under the impression that the present department have done their work well, but on that I desire, of course, to defer to the judgment of the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack. But this I do say: that our proposal of 1889 was that a clerk at the head of the establishment of clerks should take the duties of Reading Clerk upon him in addition to his ordinary duties. I wish it to be distinctly understood that we never proposed to add to the patronage of the Clerk of Parliaments. We merely gave him an opportunity of recommending to the Lord Chancellor a clerk who should, in addition to his existing duties, perform the duties at the Table, which, as everyone must admit, are not sufficiently onerous to occupy the whole time of a gentleman of ability. Under those circumstances we consider that as the appointment was limited to the establishment of which the Clerk of Parliaments is the head, it would be reasonable and obviously desirable, he knowing the gentlemen who are comprised in that establishment, that he should have that patronage—well, I will not say patronage, but should nominate the gentleman who should perform those duties. But if it comes to appointing for an absolutely different purpose an extra officer—for such he will be—to perform important duties in the Court of Appeal, then I think the Lord Chancellor himself should have, as he has at present, the statutory power of appointing that officer. That is all I wish to say on the subject. Placing aside the opinion which the Lord Chancellor has given as to the needs of the Court of Appeal, I have always considered that the recommendation of the Sub-committee of 1889—which was composed of the noble Earl opposite, Lord Kimberley, and the noble Marquess the Prime Minister, and other distinguished Peers—was a very reasonable one, and I would remind the House that it has been communicated with our Reports to the House of Commons and to the Treasury. I am not inclined to change my mind as regards that recommendation, but the point I do lay great stress upon is this: I think it is of very great importance that we should have a third Reading Clerk at the Table. The work, though it is not onerous, requires extreme care. Sometimes we have sixty or seventy notices on the Paper, and the keeping of the Minute requires a very great deal of care, and any little disturbance to the clerk who is keeping the Minute renders the duty very difficult.

I do most sincerely hope that however the matter is decided we shall be left no longer in suspense, and that the matter will be decided once for all.

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: My Lords, I cannot help feeling that this matter has been sprung upon me by surprise. The documents that I should have wished to refer to are not here, but I think I can sufficiently trust my memory to say what I have to say on the subject. In the first place, I am glad to learn that no personal object of mine is suggested in the course I pursued. The view which I take and which I must say I very strongly take is this: that the highest court in the kingdom ought not to be without one of those auxiliary persons or some of those auxiliary persons who are known in the courts of law as chief clerks or masters, or what not. The House of Lords as a Court of Appeal is the only court that has not one. I am not forgetting that at this moment the Clerk of Parliaments happens to be a lawyer. He need not be, and sometimes the Clerk of Parliaments has not been a lawyer; but as a matter of fact the present Clerk of Parliaments is a lawyer. But, my Lords, it is not the Clerk of Parliaments that is to be considered, it is the judicial staff which is required for the House as a Court of Appeal; and certainly I am very deliberately of opinion that it is something approaching a scandal that the highest Court of Appeal should not have those officials which every other court, down even to the county court, possesses; and I have been desirous, notwithstanding the Report which was made so long ago as 1889, that that scandal, as I do not hesitate to term it, should be removed. After the conciliatory tone of the speech of the noble Lord who introduced the subject I do not wish to say anything that would conflict with the harmonious spirit in which the matter has been discussed; but for the purpose of informing your Lordships I am obliged to say that the Committee, as it originally sat, thought it right to proceed without the slightest notice to me, and my first notice that such a resolution had been passed, although I was Chancellor at the time, was the fact that I received a notice of the passing of the resolution. I am quite sure it was from no intentional disrespect, but I doubt very much whether any of your Lordships would desire to alter the patronage of an office that belonged to a person without thinking it necessary to ask him to attend, so that you might form some judgment after hearing him. I venture to think that the fact of this House being a great court of law was not present to the minds of the Committee. Your Lordships who meet here at half-past four for public business are not aware—at least, it does not occur to you—that some of us have been here since a quarter or half-past ten o'clock in the morning, and it is forgotten that besides its functions as a great legislative body this House is the most important court of law in the kingdom. Certainly, having regard to the business now being done here, and to possible changes that there may be hereafter, I myself am very reluctant that the opportunity should be lost of stregthening the legal part of the House by the appointment of a lawyer to the vacant clerkship. I believe it will be a misfortune if advantage is not taken of that opportunity. Suppose one of these days a question arises as to the staff of the House of Lords as a court of law compared with the staff of other courts of law. Just imagine what would be said when it was shown that the Court of Queen's Bench or the Court of Appeal had trained lawyers as masters or chief clerks, while the highest court of all did not have that assistance. I very much object, however, to be called upon to exercise the power given to me by statute if at the same time I am to be limited in the choice that I am to make, and I thought, and I think still, that the proper course would be to repeal the statute, and, so far as I am concerned, I should not offer the smallest objection to this patronage being taken from the Lord Chancellor and transferred to the Clerk of Parliaments. But I did object, and I do object to be called upon to exercise the power which the statute gives me and yet be told that my choice is limited. Certainly if anyone were to propose to repeal that statute in the way I have suggested he will not find me opposed to it; but at the same time I have given my deliberate judgment, and I think the opportunity ought to be taken to appoint a lawyer. After what has passed, if your Lordships should confirm the view that I have expressed, I will take uncommonly good care that no one shall suggest that I have any interest in the matter of this appoint-

ment. It has occurred to me that it would be a very good course to ask the Lord Chief Justice of England to select some person whom I should appoint. I have nothing further to say to your Lordships except this, that I think that those who advised originally in this matter must feel that they made a mistake in not consulting me before that resolution was come to.

THE EARL OF MORLEY: I cannot help reminding the noble and learned Lord that he was a member of the Committee who passed this Report after a great deal of deliberation.

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: The noble Earl is speaking of a subsequent period, because at the time that Report was agreed to I had never heard of there being such a Committee at all. Although I was Chancellor for a short time in 1885 and came in again in 1886, the Committee was never called to my attention. I certainly think that they ought to have asked me to attend, and have called my attention to what was being done. That, as it appears to me, was the error that they committed. However, I have nothing further to say upon the matter.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: I was a member of that Committee, and I am quite free to say that I think it would have been much better if a communication had been made to the Lord Chancellor. But at the same time I must say that I am considerably astonished to hear that the noble and learned Lord, who had then presided over the House for two or three years, was not aware that there was a Black Rod. Committee, and was not aware that he was a member of that Committee. I believe notices of the meetings are always sent to every member. No doubt it would have been better if special notice had in this case been sent to the Lord Chancellor, but I suppose that did not occur to any member of the Committee, and unfortunately it was not done. However, my Lords, that is a matter which occurred a very long time ago, and I think it is scarcely necessary or desirable to bring up again anything which occurred then.

LORD TWEEDMOUTH: After the conversation that has taken place I certainly shall not think of troubling your Lordships with the motion. I can only say that, so far as the former Committee was concerned, no blame can very well rest upon my shoulders, because I was not a member of your Lordships' House at that time.

On Question, Report agreed to.

EDUCATIONAL GRANTS—DIFFERENTIAL TREATMENT IN RURAL AND URBAN SCHOOLS.

LORD HENEAGE, in rising to call attention to the Return issued in accordance with an Order of the House of Lords on 5th July, 1900, showing the results of the differential treatment in urban and rural schools, and to move—

"That the experiment of the last four years has been most injurious not only to the agricultural counties as a whole, but to the large majority of the Church of England voluntary schools associations, and should be discontinued,"

said: My Lords, I shall limit my very few remarks to the question of the differential treatment of schools in rural and urban districts. Some two months ago I asked my noble friend the Lord President of the Council if he would let me have a Return, which your Lordships have since had placed in your hands. My noble friend then made the very sensible suggestion that I should move for the Return as unopposed, and that any discussion should be taken after the Return had been laid. The Return has now been laid upon the Table, and we are now in a position to discuss the matter. In Lincolnshire we have lost a great deal of money, taking the rate at 5s. a head under the Act, under the differential treatment, and on two occasions the governing body of the Voluntary Schools Association of Lincolnshire has sent a memorial to the Education Department, which I hold in my hand, but with which I will not trouble your Lordships. Under the Voluntary Schools Act of 1897 the aid grant was to be not more than 5s. a head, but no precise directions were laid down as to any differential treatment between schools in urban and rural districts. The principle or the experiment, whichever you like to call it, which has now been in practice ever since the Act was passed, I venture to say has not been satisfactory either to the rural schools or to the Church of England. In the few remarks I am going to make I propose to limit myself abso-

lutely to facts and figures, and I am not going to make the slightest comment upon the Education Department. I think so far as the Departments are concerned they have given the associations every assistance they possibly could. They have shown considerable ability and the greatest courtesy to us when we have had reason to write to them for advice in conducting what has been a new and rather difficult experiment in legislation. I was told after the first year that the experiment had been a failure, and that it was likely not to be continued. Unfortunately it has now gone on for a period of four years. I am only dealing now with the three years that are put forward in the Return, during which time the rate has been paid at 5s. 9d. per child for every child in the urban districts, and 3s. 3d. per child for every child in the rural districts. I am myself unable to see, and the members of the governing bodies to which I belong are utterly unable to see, why there should be this difference of treatment between the rural and urban districts. So far as we can judge, for what it is worth—and I have been on the executive body or central committee of the Lincolnshire Voluntary Schools Association for four years—it is the rural districts and not the urban districts which require the most favourable treatment. Again, it must be remembered that, although this aid grant is allocated at a differential rate towards urban and rural schools, the money is all pooled together when it arrives in the hands of the association, and the governing body can deal with it exactly as they like. As a matter of fact they do not care whether a school is in an urban or in a rural district. They only look to the necessities of the school, and they treat it as it ought to be treated, with equity and justice. But what is very material with regard to this differential treatment is that in associations where the children in rural schools are a larger number than in urban schools they are very great losers by this differential grant. The large towns and the large urban districts gain largely. The agricultural districts—your Lordships have only to look at the Return yourselves to see this—lose enormously, but they require the aid very much more, in my opinion, than the urban districts. In the large towns in most cases there are school boards, and therefore, looking at it entirely from an educational point of view, the children would receive education whether there were voluntary schools or not, but in the rural districts they would be without education altogether in a large proportion of the parishes if it were not for voluntary schools. You could not have boards at all—you could not get the men fitted to sit on the board; you could not get the rate to pay for the schools; these schools are very small schools. In Lincolnshire—I am speaking now from what I know—they do not average more than an attendance of thirty or forty children, and anyone who takes any interest in the education given in these very small schools knows that they get a very small education grant because there are so very few children to earn the grant. They are, therefore, in a very great difficulty in that respect, while if a competent staff is to be kept up to teach the children in their parishes as you would have them taught, it is kept up at greater relative expense. Therefore these small schools require special assistance, and I do not see why the grant to them should be less than the grant to the urban districts. I will give your Lordships only one example—I could give you a great number—of how absurd and ridiculous this distinction becomes. I am not going to say that there are not good reasons for it—no doubt the noble Duke will give your Lordships what he considers good reasons; but let me deal with three parishes close together in the north of Lincolnshire. Roxby, with a population of 378, has one school with an average attendance of 43 children. But that is an urban district, so that the allocation of the aid grant is at the rate of 5s. 9d. per child. The school is solvent and non-necessitous, and receives no aid grant. Close by are the two combined parishes —really one parish—Barrow-on-Humber and New Holland. They have two schools. Their population is 3,200. In the one school the average attendance is 222, and the school is non-necessitous; in the other the average attendance is 241, and the school is specially necessitous. Both these schools are in rural districts, and the money is paid on account of them to the governing association only at the rate of 3s. 3d. per child. Yet they want all the assistance that it is possible to give them. Now, I will not detain your Lordships at any length, but I should like to quote one or two figures to prove my

case. I will ask your Lordships to allow me to deal with the results of the differential system of allocation of the Aid Grant on the agricultural county of Lincoln so far as the Church of England schools are concerned. In 1897 we had 44,253 children in average attendance. Of these 20,400 were in urban district schools, and were paid for at 5s. 9d. a head, and we received on their account £5,867 17s. 6d. The other children, 23,843, were at rural schools, and we received at the rate of 3s. 3d. a head for them, making £3,874 9s. 9d. So that, although there were 3,000 more children in the rural schools than in the urban schools, we received £2,000 less on account of payment of Aid Grant to deal with them. Similar results (I will not trouble your Lordships with the details) were arrived at in 1898 and 1899. In each of those three years we received, putting all the money together, at the rate of 4s. 5d. per head of the children. The total received in 1897 was £9,742 7s. 3d., instead of what we should have received at 5s. per head, £11,063 5s. In 1898 it was £9,731 2s., instead of £11,021 10s. In 1899 it was £9,692 3s., instead of £10,983 10s., or an actual loss of £3,759 19s. 5d. in three years, notwithstanding that we received 5s. 9d. for the children in the urban districts. Now, I have quoted the actual sums that were received on the allocation of the grant. Take those figures, in order to compare them with the figures in the Return, and you must add the second allotment, which is received some months afterwards, and in Lincolnshire amounts to one penny per child. I only say that because that shows the difference between the figures. Now, the general effect of this on the whole of the schools is that in forty-six Church of England Association schools only eight received at the rate of 5s. per head, whilst of those eight, five—London, Liverpool, Manchester, Wakefield, and Rochester—received at the rate of 5s. 6d. and upwards. The remaining thirty-eight Church of England Association schools lose on an average 10 per cent. of the present differential rate allocated. As a consequence of this principle (I do not for a moment say that it is intentional) the Roman Catholic, the British and the Wesleyan schools gain very largely, because they are schools in the urban and not in rural districts. I may quote to your Lordships a paper which has been prepared upon this point which appears to me to be very accurate and worthy of notice. It is stated in the *Schoolmaster* of the 14th July that—

"In 1897 the Church Federations of London, Liverpool, and Manchester score no smaller amount than £15,295 above the 5s. limit, the chief losers being Gloucestershire, Lincolnshire, Oxfordshire, Hertfordshire, Norfolk, Wilts, Berkshire, Kent, Cumberland, Sussex, Dorset, Durham, and Essex."

Therefore, it is practically at the cost of these other counties that these privileged federations receive their contributions. Thirty-eight Church Federations lose £27,684; that is, taking it at 5s. a head. Eight Church Federations gain £17,402, so that there is a net loss to the Church schools of over £10,000. That is the case I wish to bring forward. The memorial presented by the governing body last year, and which was again sent this year is as follows —

"The governing body of the Lincoln Diocesan Association of Voluntary Schools desire to represent to the Education Department that, in consequence of the different rates fixed for town and country schools, between which the distinction is in may cases artificial and anomalous, the total Aid Grant allotted to their Association fell short by no less a sum than £1,320 17s. 9d. of the amount which would have been received if 5s. per head had been given to town and country schools alike. The Association, having to deal with a large number of small country schools, in which the average cost per head of efficient maintenance must be greater than in any other class of schools, has therefore been unable to recommend grants adequate to help and increase the efficiency of many of the necessitous schools in its area; and it cannot with the present rates of allotment make satisfactory provision for improved training of pupil teachers, and for such objects as manual instruction in cookery."

That is the case I have to present on behalf of the Lincolnshire governing body, and I am very sorry that it should have to come on at such a late period of the session and in so small a House. I am also exceeding sorry that I had to put this matter off from Friday last until this evening, because Lord Reay, who takes a very great interest in this matter, is unable to be here.

THE LORD BISHOP OF MANCHESTER: My Lords, as the Diocesan Associations of Liverpool and Manchester have been referred to as having been specially benefited by the

distinction made between urban and rural schools, I think I should say a few words in favour of the discrimination. There are, I have no doubt, anomalies in special cases which it would be difficult to explain; but on the large scale I venture to think that there are very good reasons to be given for the present system. For instance, if you notice the number of children in the urban districts, that are spoken of rather depreciatingly by the noble Lord——

LORD HENEAGE: I did not intend to depreciate them at all.

THE LORD BISHOP OF MANCHESTER: I simply meant speaking of them depreciatingly in respect of the fact that they are a very small minority of the schools. I am trying to point out that, though they may seem to be a minority of the associations, they contain an enormous number of children in average attendance, and the London schools have as many as 120,000 children in average attendance, so that the number of children affected by any change in the present system will be considerable. Now I agree that if there be nothing different in the circumstances of the urban and village schools to justify discrimination there ought to be none; but I venture to think, at any rate, that these two reasons may be given for making the discrimination in Lancashire: first, the enormous number of school boards that exist there, the necessity of providing for rates in aid of these Board schools and also at the same time providing voluntary contributions, and the very much larger salaries that we are obliged to pay to our schoolmasters and our staff because of the competition of the Board schools making our expenses very much more than they would be. But the principal reason is this. There was an Act passed which if I am not misinformed (the Lord President will no doubt tell us) was intended mainly to benefit agricultural schools, an Act which enabled the parent of any child to demand that that child should be educated free of cost. Now that, I have no doubt, benefited greatly the agricultural districts. The fees paid there were very small, and the remission of the fee was therefore quite easy, but in the north the fees paid were very considerable—from 3d. to 6d. a week per child, and those fees were easily paid because we had a large industrial population receiving high wages. It was never felt to be a burden. We had no difficulty in obtaining the money, but the moment the opportunity was afforded to those who were the poorer amongst the parents to demand free education, of course they demanded it. Further, I would venture to say to your Lordships, because I know it to be a fact, that a number of those who are unfriendly to Voluntary schools stimulated parents to make these demands with a view to making it more difficult to conduct voluntary schools, and then a feeling of chivalry on the part of those better paid of the working classes made them feel "Rather than leave the poorer of our brethren in an invidious position we will make the demand for free education." The result is that we have lost a very large proportion of the funds upon which we relied for the maintenance of elementary schools. That deficiency must be supplied in some way. I venture to say that the defiency is small in agricultural districts because the fees charged were small and the remission was easy. The fees charged in manufacturing districts were considerable, and therefore their remission was a blow to the prosperity of the schools. Therefore, as they have these particular disabilities, I venture to submit to your Lordships it is fair that they should have a certain number of compensating advantages.

*THE BISHOP OF HEREFORD: My Lords, as representing a diocese quite at the opposite pole to that of my brother of Manchester, I should like to say a few words on this subject. I do not propose to follow him through the arguments that he has put before us, and I am not sure that I should agree absolutely and entirely with him, but my desire is rather to address myself to this question as representing one of the most rural of all the dioceses, and a diocese which has, if I may venture to say so, been more hardly hit by this method of distribution than any other diocese in the kingdom with possibly one or two exceptions. I was surprised that in the list of dioceses that had suffered the diocese of Hereford was not mentioned. The facts as put before us in this Return are that if the distribution had been at the rate of 5s. per child, we should have

received for the Hereford diocese something like £5,914. As a matter of fact, we only received £4,795 a year, thus losing a sum of £1,119, or suffering, that is to say, to the extent of nearly 20 per cent. If we look at the rate per child which is received by my two associations, the Association of Hereford and the Association of Ludlow, it only averages 4s. 1d. per child. I venture to ask your Lordships to notice that this is one of the very lowest of all the averages throughout the kingdom. Now, my Lords, I wish to join with the noble Lord who has put this question to this extent, and to say that in the diocese of Hereford there is no doubt a good deal of feeling that we do not receive more than 4s. 1d. per child; but for myself I could not go further than saying that I shall be extremely grateful to the noble Duke if he sees his way by any means to give us a larger share of this Special Aid Grant, and in appealing to him I would venture to urge two reasons—both of them I feel to be strong reasons—why he should consider the possibility of giving us a little more money for our rural schools. One is that our schools throughout my diocese are many of them so very poor that we are obliged to employ a very large number of teachers, assistant teachers in particular, with qualifications which I am sure would not satisfy your Lordships. In my diocese, even in the city of Hereford, there are a very large number of teachers who are known in the language of the Education Department as Article 68. Now, my Lords, what is an Article 68? It is simply a respectable young woman who is eighteen years of age, and she has to present no other qualification whatever for employment as a teacher. Now, some of these young women are excellent teachers, but I cannot help thinking that it is unsatisfactory that, as part of our National school system, we should be obliged to employ so many assistant teachers who are not duly qualified. Many of them, I am bound to confess, are, in intellectual qualifications, hardly fitted to be teachers of the children of our rural population. Therefore, on this ground of want of more means—for these teachers are very poorly paid; indeed, the reason they are employed is that they can be got so cheap—I venture to appeal to the noble Duke to consider as favourably as possible this application. If he does entertain it he may rest assured that any additional money given for this purpose will be well administered. I have in my hands the report of my association, and I cannot but feel that it will be satisfactory for your Lordships to know how the Special Aid Grant which we have received has been spent. I find on looking at the matter that no less than 62 per cent. of the money that we receive has been spent on the improvement of the salaries of the teachers—to my mind the very best and most economical way of spending such money, Then I find that 30 per cent. of this money has been spent on the improvement of furniture, books, apparatus, buildings, playgrounds, and the sanitary arrangement of the schools. So that on the whole sum that we have received under the Special Aid Grant something like 92 per cent. has been expended on these most excellent improvements. That I cannot but hope the noble Duke will consider gives us some claim for any additional help which he feels able to bestow upon us. But, my Lords, having said so much, I am bound to say that, looking to the facts of the case, I should not envy the noble Duke if he were to take away from the urban districts—from my brother of Manchester and others—the money which has been allocated to them. It is a task which I hope he may be able to accomplish, but from which I should shrink. I am bound also to confess, having some knowledge of town schools as well as rural schools, that many of our urban schools are no less necessitous than those in the country. For myself, if I may be permitted to add a word or two, I must acknowledge that I look to other sources of help rather than to an additional share of the Special Aid Grant. In this connection I think it right that, as representing the schools in my district, I should express my gratitude to the noble Duke for having given us the prospect of additional help through the proposed block grant. It must not be forgotten that the working of that proposed method of the block grant, so far as I have been able to investigate, and as I understand it, is likely to bring very substantial additional assistance to our country schools. I have taken occasion to look into two or three of our typical schools and see what will be the probable effect of the new block grant, and I find that, taking one of our weak schools—and I am sorry to say that

The Bishop of Hereford.

we have a great many of them, just as they have in Lincolnshire—I find it is a reasonable expectation that a school which has been receiving a grant of between £29 and £30 per annum will receive £33, so that that school will receive an advantage of something like 12 per cent. But turning to another school, of which we have a much larger proportion, that is the fair average country school—somewhat small —I find that such a school which has received £59 or £60 in the way of grants will probably receive over £70. For that addition we are very grateful. There is another class of school—there are not so many of them as we should all like to see —and that is the really good school. Now, the really good school in my district will hardly profit at all by the block grant system. A school which is receiving, perhaps, £240 or £245 per annum will be likely to lose about £5 per annum, and that, if I may venture to say so, is one of the defects of the proposed change to the block grant, that it does not give so much assistance and encouragement as I think they deserve to the best class of schools. One cannot help thinking that in every educational reform it is desirable to encourage the highest and best schools, and this change, unless it can be in some way amended, will, I fear, rather tend to lower the standard of education in some respects than to raise it. I find that the block grant has been received by the teaching profession with acclamation, and I am not surprised, because teachers are human like other people. The best teachers welcome it because it will give them more liberty to teach in the best way, and the other teachers welcome it because it gives them more freedom from minute regulation. I am afraid that under that system some slackness may come in, and individual children may be neglected, and the education may not advance in consequence as the noble Duke would desire. Therefore I hope some special care may be taken as to the instructions issued to the inspectors in order that this system may not do some harm as against the direct financial good that it will do. But, my Lords, there is still another point that I desire to urge upon the noble Duke in connection with this matter, and that is that he may give us in our best country schools very material assistance if he will make the new higher education minute apply to our good country schools. If it is simply to apply to a separate school, such as a higher grade school in a town where it is not always very welcome, then it will be almost entirely inoperative in a diocese like mine and will do practically no good, but if it could be extended so that in any good, efficient elementary country school the managers might be at liberty to add a higher elementary top, that would be a great boon to us in the country and a great assistance to our rural education. My Lords, there is just one other remark I may venture to make, and that is that while we are grateful for the additional assistance given us under the block grant, while we shall be grateful if we can have more of the Special Aid Grant, I have the profound conviction that we shall never be able to put our rural schools on a satisfactory basis, or to give the children of our rural population the sort of education that we ought to give them until Her Majesty's Government can devise some means of putting our parish schools under public management. I cannot but hope that this may be done, that the noble Duke may before long see his way to do it by introducing some Bill which will enable the managers of Voluntary schools to approach, let us say, the parish council, with a view to a parish education committee, all religious education to be reasonably safeguarded. On that parish education committee, of course, the parish council should have the majority of managers, the other managers being representatives of the trustees of the school and the parents of the children. In that case the parish would have power to levy a rate, and so to give that adequate financial support to our rural schools of which they are in such sore need in many districts.

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE: My Lords, I think it is scarcely necessary or desirable that I should attempt to follow the right rev. Prelate into a discussion of the effect of the provisions as to the block grant in the new Code, or as to the future development of higher elementary schools. The suggestions which the right rev. Prelate made are no doubt important and well deserve full consideration, but I do not think probably it would be convenient to your Lordships that I should follow him into that part of the subject at present. My Lords, I am

somewhat at a loss to understand what object my noble friend who has brought forward this resolution had in moving for a Return, and in giving us the calculations which he has founded upon it. I could have told my noble friend without any Return and without any calculations that when the Special Aid Grant is divided between urban and rural schools in the respective proportions of 5s. 9d. and 3s. 3d. the districts which contain a large number of urban schools would gain a great deal more than districts which contain a large number of rural schools. My noble friend's contention is that which I believe he has always consistently maintained. He objects to the discrimination. But it was not necessary to produce a very elaborate array of figures in order to show that the discrimination which was provided for in the Act, and which has been put into effect by the Board of Education would have the effect which it has had. That effect could have been calculated with considerable accuracy beforehand. The noble Lord said that the experiment had failed. If by failure he means that in consequence of the discrimination various districts have received various amounts, failure was inevitable; but I do not know in what way failure is proved, because, in our opinion, the discrimination has had mainly the effect which it was intended to have, and has given the greater share of the grant to what we believe to be the most necessitous cases. The reasons which induced Parliament and the Department to make this discrimination were shortly these: In the first place the rural districts generally had gained and urban districts had lost through the operation of the Fee Grant, inasmuch as in urban districts fees for 1891 were in excess of 10s., and in rural districts they were considerably under 10s. In the next place the local interest of the well-to-do classes in the maintenance of Voluntary schools is generally greater in the rural than in the urban districts; the power to raise voluntary contributions being greater, the need for further assistance is less. In the next place special provision is made for the most necessitous schools in rural districts under Articles 104 and 105 of the Code. I may say a word upon that subject by-and-by. In the next place the cost of living and therefore the amount paid for salaries is higher in the urban than in the rural districts. It may also be added that in rural districts the proportion of schools which possess liberal endowments, and are therefore not necessitous, is greater than in urban districts. Presumably in urban districts new endowments have not kept pace with the growth of population. The experience of the past three years has on the whole justified the conclusions which we drew from these facts. The rates of Aid Grant for town and country schools were fixed so as to secure as nearly as possible that the actual allotment of aid grant to the several associations should range from 4s. to 5s. 6d. per head. Now, my Lords, I refer to Articles 104 and 105 of the Code, which are articles which provide for schools in districts of very small population. The small schools in the Norwich Association (which is one of those which apparently receive a very low rate from the Special Aid Grant) received £3,930 under these articles, or 1s. 5d. per head on the attendance of all schools in the association. In the Sudbury Association they received £1,285, or nearly 2s. per head. In the Lincolnshire Association (the case of which my noble friend has brought forward) they received £4,105, or 1s. 10¼d. per head. In contrast with these figures, the schools of the London Diocesan Association received £35, or an infinitesimal fraction of a penny per head, and those of the Manchester Association received £395, or a trifle over a halfpenny per head. I think I have only to add that the Right Rev. Prelate who has just spoken was also perfectly right in saying that the new provision for a Block Grant would be a considerable assistance to schools in the rural districts. Therefore, whatever case my noble friend may have had previously to the introduction of that change, his case is somewhat weaker than it was. My Lords, I quite admit that a larger amount of assistance would be very acceptable, and probably would be admirably expended, if it were in our power to give it to rural schools, which in many districts are no doubt extremely necessitous, but, as the right rev. Prelate said just now, we could only do this at the expense of other schools which we believe to be still more necessitous, and therefore, for the present at all events, and until we see reason from further experience, I cannot hold out any hope that we shall be likely to alter the rates which the present Code has fixed.

The Duke of Devonshire.

LORD HENEAGE: I beg leave to withdraw the motion.

Motion, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

INEBRIATES AMENDMENT (SCOTLAND) BILL [H.L.].

Order of Friday last, for printing of Commons Amendment, discharged.

House adjourned at a five minutes past Seven of the clock, to Thursday next, at half past Ten of the clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 24th July, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [Lords] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz.:—

Midland Great Western Railway of Ireland Bill [Lords.]

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON LAW, ETC.

Ordered, That the Standing Committee on Law, etc., have leave to sit this day during the Sitting of the House.—(*Mr. T. W. Russell.*)

BURNLEY CORPORATION BILL [Lords].

Lords Amendment to Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to.

GREAT NORTHERN RAILWAY BILL.

MIDLAND RAILWAY BILL.

Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

ROTHERHAM CORPORATION BILL [Lords].

Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

GLASGOW BUILDING REGULATIONS BILL [Lords].

As amended, considered; Amendments made.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

SOUTH SHIELDS CORPORATION BILL [Lords].

As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

MOTHERWELL AND BELLSHILL RAILWAY BILL [Lords] (BY ORDER).

As amended, considered.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

TRAMWAYS ORDERS CONFIRMATION (No. 1) BILL [Lords].

Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

EDUCATION BOARD PROVISIONAL ORDER CONFIRMATION (LONDON) BILL [Lords].

As amended, considered; to be read the third time To-morrow.

TRAMWAYS ORDERS CONFIRMATION (No. 3) BILL [Lords].

TRAMWAYS ORDERS CONFIRMATION (No. 4) BILL [Lords].

Read a second time, and committed.

CRYSTAL PALACE COMPANY BILL [Lords].

Reported, without amendment; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time.

ROE'S PATENT BILL [Lords].

Reported, without amendment; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time.

SALFORD CORPORATION BILL [Lords].

WITHINGTON URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL BILL [Lords].

SOUTH EASTERN AND LONDON, CHATHAM, AND DOVER RAILWAYS BILL [Lords].

IPSWICH CORPORATION TRAMWAYS BILL [Lords].

BUENOS AYRES AND ROSARIO RAILWAY BILL [Lords].

Reported with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

COSTA RICA RAILWAY COMPANY BILL [Lords].

Reported, without amendment; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—London (St. Luke) Provisional Order Bill, London (Southwark) Provisional Order Bill, without amendment.

That they have agreed to—South Metropolitan Gas Bill, London and South Western Railway Bill, Aberdeen Corporation Tramways Bill, Great Western Railway Bill, with Amendments.

That they have agreed to Amendments to—Edinburgh Corporation Bill [Lords], Mersey Railway Bill [Lords], Rawmarsh Urban District Council (Tramways) Bill [Lords], without amendment.

PETITIONS.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (No. 2) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Truro and East Bristol; to lie upon the Table.

SUNDAY CLOSING (MONMOUTHSHIRE) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Hastings and Battle; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

SHEBEENS IN TOWNS (IRELAND).

Return [presented 23rd July] to be printed. [No. 295.]

POLICE ACT, 1890.

Copy presented, of correspondence relative to the refusal of the Secretary of State's Certificate under Section 17 (2) of the Act to the River Tyne Police Force, for the year ended 29th September, 1899 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

QUEEN'S COLLEGE (BELFAST).

Copy presented, of Annual Report of the President for the Session 1899–1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ARMY.

Copy presented, of Statement of Stores transferred from Navy to Land Service for South Africa up to 31st December, 1899 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

CONTRACTS FOR LOCAL AUTHORITIES (WAGES).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 9th April; *Sir Charles Dilke*]; to lie upon the table, and to be printed. [No. 296.]

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No. 2484 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TREATY SERIES (No. 15, 1900).

Copy presented, of Convention between the United Kingdom and Uruguay, renewing the Treaty of Friendship, Commerce, and Navigation of 13th November, 1885. Signed at Monte Video, 15th July, 1899. Ratifications exchanged at Monte Video, 9th June, 1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

NATAL CORRESPONDENCE.

Return presented, relative thereto [Address 9th July; *Captain Sinclair*]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS.

CHINA—BRITISH REPRESENTATION —CONSUL GENERAL WARREN.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON (Hythe): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, in view of the fact that the centre of European authority is now transferred to Shanghai, Her Majesty's Government see any ob-

jection to the immediate appointment of Mr. Pelham Warren, acting Charge d'Affaires in China.

*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): As I stated on the 20th instant, Mr. Warren has full powers to take all necessary action, but it is not considered desirable in the present state of affairs to make the change suggested by the question.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON: Might not the appointment be made as a temporary measure?

The question was not answered.

EXPORTS OF MUNITIONS OF WAR TO CHINA.

COLONEL PILKINGTON (Lancashire, Newton): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Government have come to any decision with regard to stopping the export of arms and ammunition from this country to China for the use of the Chinese; and, if so, whether he will communicate the nature of such decision to the House; and whether any ironclads, torpedo boats, or other vessels of war are now being constructed for the Chinese by British firms, or are in course of transit from British builders to the Chinese; and, if so, whether the Government intend to stop these vessels, either on the water or in the building yards.

*MR. BRODRICK: In reply to the first portion of the question the Bill announced by the First Lord of the Treasury in reply to the hon. Member for East Mayo, on Friday last, was introduced in another place on that day, and was read a second time yesterday. No ironclads, torpedo boats, or other vessels of war are now being constructed for the Chinese by British firms in this country. None are in transit from British builders to the Chinese. So far as is known none are under orders from China to be built in the United Kingdom.

RECENT NEWS FROM CHINA.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER (Kent, Thanet): Is there any news from China?

*MR. BRODRICK: I am afraid we have no fresh news to communicate.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL ARRANGEMENTS INQUIRY.

MR. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the persons appointed to report on the arrangements for the care and treatment of the sick and wounded in South Africa will have any, and what, powers to enforce the attendance of witnesses, to examine witnesses on oath, and to compel the production of documents; and, how it is proposed to protect witnesses who give evidence; and whether, with a view to extend to witnesses the protection afforded by The Witnesses (Public Inquiries) Protection Act, 1892, he will consider the propriety of holding the proposed inquiry under the authority of a Royal Commission.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): As the hon. Member is probably aware, there is no power under any form of Commission other than a Statutory Commission to take evidence on oath. This Commission, like all Commissions not directly appointed by Parliament, will therefore be without that power. I understand that the chairman of the Commission has already made public the very elaborate precautions which the Commission propose to take for the protection of witnesses, and I doubt whether any statute would give a protection so absolute. At the same time, as Parliament has passed a statute protecting witnesses before Royal Commissions—a protection which does not extend to commissions otherwise appointed—this Commission will be made a Royal Commission.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): Will the Commission have compulsory powers to insist on bringing witnesses before them?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have already stated that no Commission not appointed by Parliament except one appointed by statute has those compulsory powers.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: This Commission is a farce.

*MR. BURDETT-COUTTS (Westminster): Has a Royal Commission which derives its authority from the executive power of the Crown not those compulsory powers?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No, Sir; I have twice said so.

*MR. BURDETT-COUTTS: Then I will ask the right hon. Gentleman another question. I admit that it is rather a long question, but it can be briefly answered. In cases of Regular soldiers who believe that they will be marked men and would be ruined for life, and, therefore, will not speak; in the case of more humble people in some kind of active employment in connection with the Army Medical Department who have the same feeling and, therefore, will not speak; in the case of civilian surgeons in the employment of the Army Medical Department and dependent for their daily livelihood on the continuance of that employment and therefore will not speak; and in the case of civilian doctors——

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member is really delivering a speech and an argument. An answer has been given to the question, but the hon. Member is now proceeding to point out a number of cases in which he considers that witnesses require protection. If more information is required he should give notice of the question.

*MR. BURDETT-COUTTS: I had no intention of making a speech, I was only enumerating certain cases with regard to which I desired to ask a question. I will, however, stop the enumeration and will ask the right hon. Gentleman how, with regard to all those cases of people dependent on their employment for their existence, he proposes to obtain such important evidence without compulsory powers, and whether he proposes to give the witnesses protection?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: In my opinion the question conveys a perfectly unmerited insult upon persons who do not deserve it at his hands or anybody else's. If the hon. Gentleman will wait until he sees in print the statement made by Lord Justice Romer this morning, he will see what precautions have been taken by the Commission

BOER PRISONERS AT PRETORIA—ATTEMPT TO BLOW UP MAGAZINE.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if he will inquire whether Lieutenant Tossel, of the Transvaal Police, and Mr. Solomon Gillingham have been condemned to death in Pretoria for alleged complicity in a plot to blow up the magazine; and whether he can say if Mr. Gillingham holds military rank in the Republican Army, or what is his occupation; when the trial took place; before what tribunal; what was the evidence of guilt; when the sentence is to be carried into effect; and in what manner.

*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): There is no information at the War Office in regard to the matter referred to in the question, and it is not proposed to make any inquiry.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: Will the hon. Gentleman inquire if the War Office have received any intimation that it is the intention of the Boer military authorities to shoot some important prisoners they hold—among them two Irish lords—if these men are put to death?

BOER WOMEN SENT TO ENEMY'S LINES.

DR. TANNER (Cork County, Mid): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether the wives of all Boers now alleged to be fighting are ordered to report themselves in order that they may be sent into the enemy's lines; and, if so, can he give the reason for this order.

*MR. WYNDHAM: No information on this matter has reached the War Office.

SIR WILFRID LAWSON (Cumberland, Cockermouth): Will the hon. Gentleman make inquiry?

*MR. WYNDHAM: I see no cause for inquiry.

DR. TANNER: I will put a question again next Tuesday.

DOCTORS AND NURSES IN THE ORANGE RIVER COLONY.

DR. TANNER: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if he has any official information showing that, in consequence of the arrangements, out of twenty-four nurses employed in the Orange River Colony, fourteen have succumbed; and whether 100 more doctors and 200 nurses are now required,

and stores stacked at base are to be sent up to the front.

*MR. WYNDHAM: Eight nurses have died in South Africa. Lord Roberts has quite recently asked for twenty more surgeons and fifty nurses. These are being sent. It is usual for stores to be stacked at the base and sent up as required.

ARTILLERY AMMUNITION SUPPLIES.

MR. YERBURGH (Chester): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War what was the reserve of field and horse artillery in this country when the South African Republic declared war; and how many rounds per gun were sent to South Africa with the Army Corps; and how many rounds per gun were sent with the batteries which went from India to Durban; and whether, in order to make up the artillery ammunition required for the war, recourse was had to foreign manufacturers.

*MR. WYNDHAM: In introducing a Supplementary Estimate on Friday, I propose to make a statement dealing with reserves of ammunition and other equipment. Perhaps the hon. Member will allow me to defer replying to him till then.

INOCULATION AGAINST TYPHOID.

MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that the Director General of the Army Medical Department, at the Indian Medical Service dinner on 14th June, stated that the results of inoculation for typhoid, while it afforded some protection against contracting the disease, rather increased the risk of death when contracted, but that this only applied to the men, as both the incidence and case mortality among officers appeared to be increased by inoculation; and whether the recent statistics of Professor Wright, of Netley, which show that both attacks and deaths from typhoid are seven times less in the inoculated than in the uninoculated, applied equally to officers and men separately.

*MR. WYNDHAM: I have no knowledge of the statement attributed to the Director General of the Army Medical Department, and, as I have already explained to the House on more than one occasion, the statistics at present available are not sufficient to enable me to give a satisfactory reply to the question.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Will the hon. Gentleman inquire of the Director General if he made the statement?

*MR. WYNDHAM: I am not in the habit of asking my friends what they say in after-dinner speeches.

VOLUNTEERS AND GARRISON DUTY.

MR. SEELY (Lincoln): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether he can state to the House how many Volunteer regiments offered their services to the Government last winter for garrison duty, and whether any were asked to undertake it and were unable to do so.

*MR. WYNDHAM: No Volunteer corps has been asked to undertake garrison duty. Sixteen corps offered their services for various purposes in the course of last winter, but it was not found necessary to take advantage of these patriotic offers. It is difficult to give an answer which will not mislead. Excepting regular garrison artillery at military ports, there are no fixed garrisons in this country so long as an attack on it is not apprehended. There is a certain amount of barrack accommodation, and that has been overcrowded since the beginning of the war. At this moment we have 50,000 more Regulars and Militia than we could accommodate in barracks when the camping season is over. So that it would have been impossible to accept offers from Volunteers for home service in the winter.

SMALL ARM AMMUNITION SUPPLIES.

MR. FABER (York): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War, at the time when he stated that it was intended to use Mark IV. ammunition at foreign stations for practice purposes only, what was the amount of other serviceable small arms ammunition available in the country, and when the manufacture of Mark II. ammunition was commenced.

*MR. WYNDHAM: The hon. Member will no doubt see that it is not expedient to give such information except in general terms. On the date mentioned — namely, 24th July,

1899, taking the authorised reserve at 400 rounds per man armed with a rifle, 200 rounds per man with carbine—infantry, maximum, 28,000; cavalry, maximum, 45,000—we had an excess of 7,000,000 rounds above that reserve so calculated. In spite of the subsequent adoption of Mark V. and readoption of Mark II., we have been able to secure an ample output from the factory to the trade.

STORES BORROWED BY ARMY FROM NAVY.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if he can state when the promised Return of warlike stores borrowed by the Army from the Navy will be laid upon the Table.

*MR. WYNDHAM: The preparation of this Return has been delayed in order to make it as complete as possible in the imperfect state of our information, but it will be laid on the Table to-night, and I hope that advance copies will be available this evening.

SOUTH DENES CAMP—SISTERS OF NAZARETH.

DR. TANNER: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to the regulations issued by Colonel Brownrigg, inspecting the Volunteers on the South Denes, Yarmouth, forbidding the Sisters of Nazareth to collect pennies from the 4,000 Volunteers now in camp; whether Colonel Brownrigg has any authority for issuing such regulations; if he is aware that the sisterhood who were sent back are of the same order as that which was so highly commended for nursing the sick and wounded in South Africa; and if there were 1,000 Catholic Volunteers in the camp at the time.

*MR. WYNDHAM: I must apologise to the hon. Member for having unintentionally misinformed him in reply to his former question on this subject. I told him that the matter was within the competence of Colonel Brownrigg, and that the War Office did not interfere. I now learn that a circular was issued by the Adjutant General in October last, prohibiting the practice of ladies entering barracks for the purpose of collecting alms. It was under this order that Colonel Brownrigg acted, and he had, of course, no option but to do so.

PUBLIC SCHOOL ARMY COMMISSIONS—ETON.

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, S.E.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether certain commissions for the Army have been allotted to the head master of Eton; and will the recipients be allowed to pass without the usual competitive examination.

*MR. WYNDHAM: Nineteen commissions have been assigned to public schools, of which two have been allotted to Eton. The nominees will be treated like the other recipients of direct commissions, and will not be required to pass a competitive examination.

MAJOR RASCH: What is the reason for this extraordinary preference?

*MR. WYNDHAM: I pointed out some time ago that all those who received direct commissions were to be twenty years of age. I announced that twenty commissions would be given to public schools, and as a matter of fact nineteen have been given.

1ST VOLUNTEER BATTALION LEICESTERS—SUPPLY OF RIFLES.

MAJOR RASCH: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that the 1st Volunteer Battalion Leicesters is 1,560 strong, that they have only (19th July) five rifles to six men, and that they indented for 230 on 5th June, twenty-one on 12th June, and fifty on 12th July, and were informed that none were available; and whether, as they go into camp on Salisbury Plain, 5th August, and must have the arms to earn the additional grant, the War Office will consider the propriety of supplying them.

*MR. WYNDHAM: This battalion has up to date demanded 261 rifles, and these were sent from Weedon on the 17th instant.

THE CHANNEL AND MEDITERRANEAN FLEETS.

*SIR J. COLOMB (Great Yarmouth): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether Returns are furnished by the Admirals commanding the Channel and Mediterranean Fleets showing the time spent in harbour, the time spent at sea, the duration and nature of evolutions

practised at sea, the state of the weather prevailing during such evolutions, and all such information as may be necessary to enable the Admiralty to record and judge the nature and extent of opportunities given for the sea-training of officers and men of these fleets; and, if so, are such Returns furnished quarterly or half-yearly.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. GOSCHEN, St. George's, Hanover Square): The Returns and reports furnished by Admirals in command of squadrons, together with the programmes of their proposed movements which are submitted for approval, are such as to enable the Admiralty to judge of the nature and extent of the cruises taken by them, and of the opportunities for sea-training to the officers and men afforded by them. Some of these Returns are quarterly, but reports of proceedings are received at shorter intervals.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER (Belfast, W.): May I ask whether it is not a fact that the time spent at sea has been singularly short in the last two years?

MR. GOSCHEN: No, Sir.

NAVAL COURTS MARTIAL—LAW OF EVIDENCE.

MR. H. D. GREENE (Shrewsbury): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether, in fulfilment of his promise, he has consulted the Lords of the Admiralty as to extending the provisions of the Criminal Evidence Act, 1898, to naval courts martial, and with what result.

MR. GOSCHEN: Yes; Sir; steps will be taken to extend the provisions of the Criminal Evidence Act, 1898, to naval courts martial.

PORT GUARDSHIP FOR THE MERSEY —RECRUITING.

MR. CHARLES M'ARTHUR (Liverpool, Exchange). I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he has considered the desirability of placing a port guardship in the Mersey; or, if that course is impracticable, of arranging for the more frequent visit of one or more of Her Majesty's ships to the port of Liverpool; and whether, having regard to the efforts made locally to arouse public interest in the Navy, and to the number of respectable lads who might volunteer for the service if the opportunity were afforded to them, it would be possible to provide some further facilities for the enlistment and training of recruits for the Royal Navy or Royal Naval Reserve.

MR. GOSCHEN: In 1884 the port guardship was removed to Holyhead, as the Mersey was found an unsuitable anchorage on account of the strong tides and crowded state of the river and great steamer traffic; boat work was difficult, and collisions took place with passing steamers. For these reasons it is not contemplated to again place a ship in the Mersey. The "Northampton" visits Liverpool occasionally for recruiting purposes, and will most likely do so again next year. Her last visit was in 1897. With reference to the last paragraph of the hon. Gentleman's question, recruiting at Liverpool has been quite up to the mark as compared with other recruiting centres.

NORTHERN TERRITORY OF AUSTRALIA.

MR. HOGAN (Tipperary, Mid): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the administration of the Northern Territory by South Australia is of a permanent or temporary character; what rights, if any, in this territory are still retained by the Imperial Government; and in what relation will the Northern Territory stand towards the Government of the Australian Commonwealth.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): The Northern Territory was annexed to South Australia by Letters Patent in 1863, Her Majesty reserving full right to revoke or amend these Letters Patent. So long as these remain unaltered the territory is an integral part of the colony. The Imperial Government have exactly the same rights in the Northern Territory as in any other part of the colony, which will enter the Commonwealth as a whole, and will stand in the same relation to the Government of the Commonwealth as the rest of the colony.

TONGA PROTECTORATE.

MR. HOGAN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he

is now in receipt of detailed official information concerning the circumstances under which a protectorate over Tonga was proclaimed; and, if so, whether such information shows that no protectorate flag was hoisted and no reply given by the Tongan Government to the salute of twenty-one guns fired from H.M.S. "Porpoise."

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Mr. Thomson's report has been received and is now under consideration. I do not understand what is meant by a protectorate flag. The British flag is not hoisted when a protectorate is proclaimed, but only when a country is taken possession of by Her Majesty. I am not aware that the circumstances in which the salute was fired by Her Majesty's ship "Porpoise" were such as to call for a reply from the Tonga Government. I may state, however, that in accordance with the usual practice in protectorates the British flag was hoisted by the Tongan Government alongside the Tongan flag on Her Majesty's birthday, and duly saluted with twenty-one guns.

INDIAN FAMINE—PRIVATE CHARITY.

SIR WILLIAM WEDDERBURN (Banffshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether, with a view to stimulate liberality in subscriptions to the Indian Famine Fund, he will, by a detailed statement, make clear to the public what branches of relief are undertaken by the Indian Government and what branches are dependent upon private charity; and whether he can give a rough estimate of the total expenditure required from the Government of India and from private charity respectively in order to deal suitably with the present calamity.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord G. HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): If the hon. Baronet will read any of the statements which I have sent to the Lord Mayor, or the various published letters I have written to the different organisations who have been, and are collecting funds for the Indian Charitable Famine Fund, he will there find clearly stated the branches of relief work undertaken by the Government and the subsidiary spheres of work reserved for charity. As regards the second question, the hon. Baronet will perhaps allow me to reserve till Thursday the general and detailed statement I shall be ready to make upon the famine expenditure.

CANADA AND THE INDIAN FAMINE.

SIR WILLIAM WEDDERBURN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that in April last several Members of the Canadian House of Commons urged the Colonial Government to make a substantial grant to the Indian famine fund; and that the Premier, in reply, announced that the Government was in communication with the Home authorities on the subject; and whether he can state what was the result of this communication.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Yes; I have seen the report of the discussion to which the hon. Member refers. I have not yet, however, received any communication from the Dominion Government on the subject.

RANGOON OUTRAGE—COMMAND OF THE ROYAL WEST KENT REGIMENT.

SIR LEWIS M'IVER (Edinburgh, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether Brigadier General Rolland was removed from his command as Brigadier on the ground of alleged apathy and inaction in what is known as the Royal West Kent Regiment case; and, if so, whether the Secretary of State can name any specific act or omission on the part of Colonel Rolland justifying this charge; and whether he can state anything in the matter which Colonel Rolland could have done, or ought to have done, and which he failed to do.

LORD G. HAMILTON: The ground upon which Colonel Rolland was removed from his command in connection with the gross outrage committed at Rangoon in April, 1899, was that, being in immediate command at Rangoon, and primarily responsible for discipline at the station, he showed an apathy and inaction which conduced to a miscarriage of justice. His case was most carefully considered by the Commander in Chief in India, by the Government of India, and by myself in Council; and, in allowing Colonel Rolland to remain in the Service, I adopted the most lenient course that was open to me under the circumstances.

FIELD BATTERIES IN INDIA.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether no such decision, tending to the reduction of guns in heavy field batteries in India, has been taken, as is suggested in the Blue-book containing the financial statement and debate in the Viceroy's Council, recently laid before Parliament.

LORD G. HAMILTON: The question of the conversion of four heavy field batteries of four guns each into two howitzer batteries of six guns each is inseparably connected with other large questions of artillery organisation which are under consideration in communication with the War Office, and it has not yet been decided.

RECEIVING HOMES FOR PAUPER CHILDREN.

MR. FLOWER (Bradford, W.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether the Lambeth Guardians have accepted the suggestion of the Board to establish a receiving home for pauper children; and, if not, whether the Board are prepared to insist upon their proposal being carried out.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. CHAPLIN, Lincolnshire, Sleaford): The guardians have not yet accepted the suggestion made by the Local Government Board in this matter, and the Board are still in communication with them on the subject.

FEEBLE-MINDED PAUPERS.

MR. FLOWER: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is able to comply with the request contained in the memorial presented to him by the Association for Promoting the Welfare of the Feeble-Minded, and will cause an inquiry to be held as to the number and condition of feeble-minded paupers, not certifiable as lunatics.

MR. CHAPLIN: This matter is receiving my consideration, and I propose in the first instance to endeavour to obtain from the guardians information with respect to the number and condition of persons of the class referred to who are in workhouses.

WANDSWORTH GUARDIANS AND DESERTED CHILDREN.

MR. FLOWER: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if his attention has been drawn to the issue of a public notice by the Wandsworth Board of Guardians, in which a free pardon was offered to the parents of some 300 children who should reclaim them on a given date; can he state whether the issue of such notice was sanctioned by the Local Government Board; and, whether they have addressed any communication to the guardians on the matter.

MR. CHAPLIN: I have made inquiry on this subject, and I am informed that a committee of the guardians, in going through the list of children chargeable to the Union, found that there were between two and three hundred cases in which the parents had been lost sight of, and in very few of which the guardians could prove desertion or take any proceedings. The notice is stated to have been issued for the purpose of inviting parents, who had left their children for years, to call on the guardians and arrange to take their children away. In consequence of the notice about thirty children were handed over to their parents. No sanction to the notice was given by the Local Government Board. The notice appears to me to have been open to objection, and a letter has been sent to the guardians pointing this out, and stating that in the opinion of the Board the practice of issuing such a notice should be discontinued.

TUBERCULOSIS IN WEST CHESHIRE.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board, whether he is aware that at a recent meeting of the Northwich Rural Council a communication was received from the county medical officer of health, Dr. Vacher, stating that he was informed by the medical officer of health for Manchester that a cow with a tuberculosis udder had been found on a farm in West Cheshire; that Dr. Nevin wrote to Dr. Vacher advising to isolate the infected cow, to dry her at once, and have her fed for slaughter; whether the Local Government Board have sanctioned such a system; and whether he is aware that Dr. Vacher, in conjunction with the late Inspector Wagstaffe, inaugurated and

carried out a series of tuberculosis prosecutions in Birkenhead.

MR. CHAPLIN: The facts appear to be substantially as stated in the first paragraph of the question. The cow, however, was not sold, but was destroyed by the farmer. The answer to the second paragraph of the question is in the negative. Dr. Vacher, before becoming county medical officer was medical officer of health for Birkenhead, and I am informed that during this period the Birkenhead Town Council, as advised by him, arranged for a much more thorough inspection of meat intended for the food of man than had previously been attempted, and appointed Mr. Wagstaffe to give his whole time to the work. Dr. Vacher appears, however, to have had nothing to do with the present case, except to inform the Northwich Rural District Council of the communication he had received from Dr. Nevin.

WIMBLEDON—PROPOSED SCHOOL BOARD.

MR. PRICE (Norfolk, E.): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether the Education Department has received the resolution adopted by the ratepayers of Wimbledon on 9th July, asking for a school board for the parish; and whether an order for the election has been issued; if not, when it will be issued.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL ON EDUCATION (Sir J. GORST, Cambridge University): The answer to the first paragraph is in the affirmative. The order for election has not yet been issued. The matter is still under consideration.

HOLYHEAD NATIONAL SCHOOL—RELIGIOUS FREEDOM OF TEACHERS.

MR. ELLIS J. GRIFFITH (Anglesey): I beg to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education whether his attention has been called to the fact that repeated demands have been made by the Education Department upon the managers of the Holyhead National School that they should sign the memorandum of agreement of Nellie Roberts, a pupil teacher at the infants' department of that school, but that, although she has been a recognised pupil teacher for over three years, these demands have not yet been complied with; and what reasons are assigned by the managers for their non-compliance.

SIR J. GORST: Notice of this question was only received this morning, and I have not yet been able to obtain the information.

MR. ELLIS J. GRIFFITH: I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether he is aware that, on the 11th of April last, the Rev. Canon Thomas, one of the managers of the Holyhead National School, called Nellie Roberts and another pupil teacher before him, in the presence of the head teachers, and after inquiring of each if they were willing to attend the services of the Church of England and to assist in the Sunday School, and being answered by the first negatively and by the second affirmatively, that he proceeded to sign the memorandum of agreement of the latter and informed Nellie Roberts that he would leave her agreement unsigned for a time, so as to give her an opportunity of deciding whether she would comply with his demands that she should renounce her Nonconformity; and will he cause inquiry to be made in this case.

SIR J. GORST: The Board of Education have no control over the conditions in respect of religion under which pupil teachers are engaged. But I will inquire into the allegations of the hon. Member.

MR. ELLIS J. GRIFFITH: I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education, whether he is aware that the managers of the Holyhead National School habitually bring pressure to bear upon all their teachers to attend Church of England services and to be confirmed, and that out of nine Nonconformists employed at the school seven have been obliged to comply with these demands, although the parents are Nonconformists, and that this is the only school available for a Nonconformist district; and whether, seeing that repeated applications by the Holyhead School Board to be allowed to build a school have been refused, and that the National school is generally overcrowded, he will state what steps the Board of Education will take in this matter.

SIR J. GORST: The Board of Education have no power to interfere in a matter of this kind. I will inquire into the matter referred to in the second paragraph.

MR. ELLIS J. GRIFFITH: I beg to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education whether his attention has been called to the fact that nearly all the pupil teachers in the Holyhead National School are paid one shilling per week less than the amount agreed upon by the managers and specified in their memoranda of agreement; and what measures the Board of Education intend taking to enforce the proper carrying out of Clauses 1 and 3 of the memorandum of agreement.

SIR J. GORST: No complaint of the non-fulfilment by the managers of the Holyhead National School of the conditions of their agreement with pupil teachers has, so far as I know, reached the Board of Education. If such complaint were made it would at once be inquired into.

SCIENCE AND ART INSTRUCTION IN LONDON BOARD SCHOOLS.

MR. EVELYN CECIL (Hertfordshire, Hertford): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether he is aware that numerous scholars nominally in public elementary schools under the London School Board, who receive instruction exclusively under the regulations of the Science and Art Directory and not under the Code, have their attendances registered both on the registers of the Science and Art Department and in duplicate on the attendance books of the public elementary schools; and that this duplicate registration brings the cost of the instruction so given to science and art scholars into the accounts of the ordinary elementary school, and thus causes it to be paid for out of the School Board rate levied for elementary education only; and whether, seeing that this registration of science and art scholars on the books of the public elementary school is prohibited by Clause 18 of the Science and Art Directory, he will state what steps he has taken or proposes to take in the matter.

SIR J. GORST: The answer to the first paragraph is in the affirmative. The Board of Education have refused to pay Science and Art Grants in respect of any scholar registered in the manner described.

MR. EVELYN CECIL: Does my right hon. friend mean that the officials of the Board of Education have been sustaining what I cannot but describe as a serious public fraud?

GENERAL POST OFFICE—REMOVAL TO MOUNT PLEASANT—OVERTIME ALLOWANCES.

MR. STEADMAN (Tower Hamlets, Stepney): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if the London postmen whose deliveries have been protracted by the recent removal to St. Martin's-le-Grand, and particulars of whose cases have already been submitted to him, are to be paid for the overtime thus worked.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. HANBURY, Preston): Yes, Sir; arrangements are in progress for distributing the payments for overtime.

LONDON POSTAL DELAYS—SUGGESTED INQUIRY.

MR. STEADMAN: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if, in view of the fact that sorters and postmen have been charged by officials of the Department with malingering and with being responsible for recent postal delays in London, he will appoint a Committee to inquire with whom the responsibility really rests.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The Postmaster General informs me that, as far as he is aware, no definite charges of the kind referred to by the hon. Member have been made. There seems to be no useful purpose likely to be served by such a Commission as he suggests.

MR. STEADMAN: Although, perhaps, the Postmaster General has not heard of the charges made against the men, is the right hon. Gentleman aware that officials under the Postmaster General have brought charges against the men in the public press?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am not aware of that. Perhaps the hon. Gentleman will give me some information as to the

details, but at present the information is not in harmony with that I have received from the Postmaster General.

MR. STEADMAN: I will take the earliest opportunity afforded by the rules of the House to state the case of the men to the right hon. Gentleman.

THE WIDENING OF PICCADILLY.

MR. COGHILL (Stoke-on-Trent): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether he has made any proposal to the County Council to add part of the Green Park to Piccadilly, and whether his proposal will be submitted to the House of Commons.

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. AKERS DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): I have made a proposal to the London County Council to the effect that if they will undertake the cost of widening Piccadilly, according to a plan which has been laid before them, I will endeavour to procure the necessary Royal Warrant to obtain a strip of the Green Park required for the purpose. The work, if carried out according to the plan, will in no way injure the park, but will confer an immense boon upon the public at large. I shall be very happy to explain the plan to my hon. friend, and will see that it is placed in the Tea Room for the inspection of hon. Members. As no public money is involved, no Estimate will be submitted to Parliament, but the question could, of course, be discussed on Class II., Vote 25, which still remains to be taken. The procedure in this case is in exact accordance with those precedents where land has been taken from Royal parks for the purpose of widening public streets, where no other conditions are involved.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): To what extent will the road be widened?

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: For the greater portion of the way it will be practically 70 feet wide, and wider at Park Lane.

DIETARY IN IRISH WORKHOUSES.

CAPTAIN DONELAN (Cork, E.): On behalf of the hon. Member for South Monaghan, I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that at a recent meeting of the Halstead Board of Guardians, Mr. Bagenal, Local Government Board Inspector, said that the Local Government Board would soon issue an order putting the guardians of the workhouse on a different footing with regard to the dietary of the inmates; whether he is aware that Mr. Bagenal said that the guardians would not be tied down to any particular dietary, and that so long as nutritious food was given to the inmates the Local Government Board would not interfere; and whether he can say if he will direct the Local Government Board in Ireland to give greater freedom to the guardians in Ireland in their treatment of the poor and management of the workhouses, as the Local Government Board in England are about doing with the English Boards of Guardians.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. G. W. BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): I have no information regarding the first and second paragraphs. With reference to the third paragraph, boards of guardians in Ireland, provided they do not reduce their scale of dietary below the minimum scale laid down by the General Regulations, have practically quite as free a hand as the English boards in carrying out any improvements or variations in the dietary which their medical officer suggests. The minimum scale now in force in Ireland was fixed in the year 1849, when the standard of comfort of the poorer classes was very much lower than it is at present, but as the boards of guardians have been gradually improving the dietary of workhouse inmates it has not been found necessary to bind the guardians down to any new or uniform scale. A considerable difference, however, exists in the scales of dietary in use in the various workhouses throughout Ireland, and many are open to much improvement. In November last the Local Government Board addressed a circular to the several boards of guardians calling attention to this diversity and expressing the opinion that the existing dietaries might, in many instances, be revised on more varied lines with regard to the dietary of the children, the infirm and lunatic classes. The Board requested the guardians, after consultation with their medical officer, to take the matter into consideration, and also forwarded for the guardians' infor-

mation a copy of a suggested dietary scale. As a result, a number of unions have adopted either the scale suggested by the Board or some modification of it.

IRISH LAND PURCHASE—THE ASHBOURNE ACT.

CAPTAIN DONELAN: On behalf of the hon. Member for South Monaghan, I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that purchasers of land in Ireland under the Ashbourne Act are not placed in as favourable a position as purchasers under the Land Purchase Acts of 1892 and 1896, both with regard to the sinking fund and a reduction of the instalments every ten years; and whether, seeing that purchasers under the Ashbourne Acts bought when judicial rents were higher, he will consider the necessity and justice of placing these purchasers on as good terms as the purchasers under the Land Purchase Acts of 1892 and 1896 with reference to the sinking fund and payment of future instalments.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: On the 3rd inst. I replied very fully to a similar question addressed by me to the hon. Member for South Monaghan,* and to that reply I have nothing to add.

BOATING IN HOWTH HARBOUR.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: On behalf of the hon. Member for Dublin County, N., I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that at the last Howth (county Dublin) Petty Sessions, four boatmen were prosecuted at the suit of the Royal Irish Constabulary for plying for hire with their boats in Howth Harbour without having obtained the necessary licence from the Board of Works; can he state who authorised the constabulary to prosecute; and whether it is a part of their duty to act for the Board of Works when required to do so by that body; and whether it is the intention of the Government to enforce the payment of the fines or costs that have been imposed in the cases referred to.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: The prosecutions in these cases were at the suit, not of the constabulary, but of the Commissioners of Public Works. The police do not act for the Commissioners in matters of this kind. As regards the last paragraph, the question of the enforcement of the fines or costs is one for the consideration of the Board of Works.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: On behalf of the hon. Member for Dublin County, N., I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether his attention has been drawn to the case of four boatmen who were last week prosecuted at Howth (county Dublin) Petty Sessions for plying for hire with boats without a licence from the Board of Works; whether it was with the sanction of the Board of Works that this prosecution was instituted; and whether, if the Board of Works insist on boatmen who ply for hire with boats obtaining a licence to do so, it will cause the harbour to be so dredged that it will not be necessary, as the boatmen referred to declared, to carry passengers on their backs across a portion of Howth Harbour.

MR. HANBURY: The prosecution was instituted by the Board of Works, who are the Commissioners of the harbour. In three of the cases no licence had been taken out for two years, and in the fourth case for four years. Dredging is impracticable over about half of the harbour because of the rockiness of the bed. But it is carried on where feasible at the East Pier, and in any case several flights of steps are available for embarking and landing passengers both at the east and west pier at all states of the tide. The harbour master reports that he has never seen nor heard of licensed boatmen having to carry passengers on their backs to reach the boats.

FAIR RENT APPEALS IN CORK.

MR. MAURICE HEALY (Cork): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that only one sitting of a Sub-commission for the hearing of fair rent applications has been held in the Cork Union during the present year, and that at that sitting no case was listed in which the notice was served later than December, 1898; and whether any steps will be taken to expedite the hearing of pending fair rent applications.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: The most recent list of fair rent applications for hearing in the County Cork contains all cases from the union of Cork in which

* See preceding volume of *The Parliamentary Debates*, page 410.

the applications were received prior to Christmas 1898. A Sub-commission has sat in Cork upon two occasions during the present year. There are only forty-one cases from that district received to the present date which have not yet been listed for hearing.

BELFAST POSTAL ARRANGEMENTS.

SIR JAMES HASLETT (Belfast, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that in the districts of Belfast, Fortwilliam, Lisburn Road, Malone Road, Belmont, and Bloomfield, the latest delivery of letters is four o'clock in the evening; and whether steps will be taken to have a later delivery arranged for.

MR. HANBURY: Portions of Lisburn Road and Malone Road are within the town delivery of Belfast, and have a delivery of letters commencing as late as 8 p.m. The remaining portions of those roads and the other places referred to by the hon. Member are outside the town postal district, and the latest delivery takes place at about 4 p.m. as stated by the hon. Member. The question of giving a later delivery in those districts will be considered.

NEWBLISS RURAL POSTMAN.

MR. MACALEESE (Monaghan, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that William Taylor, rural postman, Newbliss, attended the Orange demonstration at Clones on the 12th inst., and performed as a drummer, in one of the party bands upon that occasion; and does conduct of this kind on the part of postmen receive the sanction of the Department, or will any remonstrance be addressed to Taylor.

MR. HANBURY: William Taylor is employed about four hours a day as a rural auxiliary postman at Newbliss. He attended at the Orange demonstration at Clones, and acted as drummer. He was off duty at the time, and was not in uniform, and the matter is not one of which it is thought necessary to take any official notice.

WEST CLARE FISHERIES.

MAJOR JAMESON (Clare, W.): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture for Ireland, in reference to the recent deputation and correspondence on the subject of assistance being given by the Government to the fishing industry of West Clare, will the Department of Agriculture give assistance in aid of the fishing industry in West Clare; and, if so, what sum will the Department of Agriculture allocate to West Clare out of the grant by Government voted for that purpose.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOR IRELAND (Mr. PLUNKETT, Dublin County, S.): The Department is considering what steps may be taken to develop the fishing industry in West Clare. The amount of money available for the purpose cannot be stated until the requirements of other districts are ascertained.

SALARIES OF IRISH NATIONAL TEACHERS.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that in numerous instances the salaries of Irish National teachers for the quarter ended 30th June have been delayed in payment beyond the day appointed for the purpose by the Commissioners, and that this delay has occurred notwithstanding that the quarterly returns were received in the Education Office in due time and in correct form; and, whether he will inquire into the causes of the delay, and if steps will be taken to guard against a repetition of this irregularity, which is productive of inconvenience to the teachers.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: The salaries of the teachers have not been delayed in payment in numerous cases as stated, when the claims were received in due time and were regular in form. If any specific case of delay is brought under the notice of the Commissioners, they will, as they always have done, order a strict investigation into the matter.

MONEY-LENDING BILL [Lords].

Reported from the Standing Committee on Law, etc., with Amendments.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 297.]

Minutes of Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 297.]

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be considered upon Thursday, and to be printed. [Bill 312.]

COMPANIES BILL.

As amended (by the Standing Committee) considered.

*MR. SPEAKER: The motion on the Paper in the name of the hon. Member for Northampton is not in order, as this is a Bill to amend the law relating to registered companies only, and does not relate to chartered companies.

A Clause (Application of the Act to Scotland)—(*The Lord Advocate*)—brought up, and read the first and second time, and added.

COLONEL WELBY (Taunton): I beg to move that Clause 2 be omitted.

Question proposed, "That Clause 2 stand part of the Bill."

MR. RADCLIFFE COOKE (Hereford): I suppose the right hon. Gentleman in charge of this Bill will also accept the omission of the following clause?

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (MR. RITCHIE, Croydon): I find myself unable to resist the Amendment of my hon. and gallant friend. As those who are acquainted with what took place in the Grand Committee will remember, I made a similar recommendation there, but it was not adopted by the Committee. I will state the reason why I now feel bound to accept the Amendment. I do not propose to enter into the merits of this clause or of the next one. I admit that there are evils which require to be remedied, but I do not desire to commit myself to the particular mode of amendment embodied in these clauses. My main reason for assenting to the Amendment of my hon. friend is that in my opinion these clauses are not germane to the Bill, and I think that to attempt to introduce definitions as to what businesses may or may not be carried on by a company would be to run counter to all precedent, and would cause excessive inconvenience. Therefore, as I desire to say nothing against the principle of the clauses, I suggest to the House that it would do well to accept the Amendment and omit these two clauses.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): When this Bill was before the Grand Committee I expressed the opinion that it would be better to leave these clauses out of the Bill, as they had nothing whatever to do with its main object and scope. They relate to an extremely important subject, which I am inclined to think should be dealt with even more strongly than is proposed in these clauses. But I repeat that it would be better to omit this portion of the Bill altogether, as it raises an entirely different set of questions to that dealt with by the rest of the Bill.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): Considering that everybody connected with the Bill is under the belief that the clauses have nothing whatever to do with it, I think some explanation should be afforded us as to how they got into the Bill. Can the President of the Board of Trade explain how, in spite of the forms and orders of the House, clauses were inserted in a Bill with which they had nothing whatever to do?

MR. RITCHIE: The clauses were put in the Bill in the House of Lords, and I, of course, am not capable of explaining the reasons why. As, however, they were inserted, I deemed it only right and courteous to the House that the Bill should be introduced here in the form in which it was sent down last session.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: That renders it more inexplicable than ever. The House of Lords sent the Bill to a Select Committee, which was charged with the duty of crossing the "t's" and dotting the "i's," and I therefore cannot comprehend how they came to pass clauses which the President of the Board of Trade and his predecessor are both agreed have been improperly inserted. Under the circumstances, of course the House will agree to their omission.

SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston): I hope that the House will not do anything of the kind. These clauses are the result of a great deal of consideration. They have been introduced into this Bill in two successive sessions, and they were also introduced in a separate Bill. The Lord Chancellor, in introducing the Bill, deliberately recommended these clauses as the best method of regulating certain dangers and difficulties to which the public are exposed under the existing state of the law. It was done after deliberate consultation with persons affected. I am

perfectly aware that I cannot discuss the merits of Clause 3 at the present time, although the right hon. Gentleman has indicated that that clause will have to go if the one now under discussion is omitted. I feel bound in the public interest to support the retention of the clause. I feel that in yielding the right hon. Gentleman is yielding to the clamour of a class, because the clause interferes to a certain extent with large trading concerns. If the clauses are not retained I feel that an opportunity will have been lost of putting on the Statute-book provision likely to be of great good to the public by protecting them against many forms of illegal practice in pharmacy, medicine, and dentistry. I speak in the interest of the public, and I hope the House will consider carefully before it yields to a panic on the part of the right hon. Gentleman caused by the opposition of certain trade interests.

SIR JAMES HASLETT (Belfast, N.) said the second clause proposed that a company should be entitled to assume a title which no individual might take unless he passed a certain examination. Surely that was a bad policy. He did not claim any special immunity so far as Ireland was concerned. They might start as many companies as they liked there. It was a poor country, its business was poor. If a man got a Sunday dinner, he lived on the recollection of it for two or three days, and then he lived on the anticipation of another Sunday dinner for the rest of the week. But he did ask the House to be true to itself. It had passed a Pharmaceutical Act which required a man to pass an examination before he was entitled to do certain things or to assume a certain title. Now it was proposed to absolutely wipe out that qualification, and to enable a company to carry on the business without examination; the only point in its favour being that it was possessed of pounds, shillings, and pence. He thought the Government had very wisely decided that these clauses had nothing whatever to do with a Companies Bill, and should therefore be omitted.

MR. LAWSON WALTON (Leeds, S.): I should not have intervened in this discussion had it not been for the suggestion that the Government in agreeing to the omission of these clauses was yielding to clamour. I entirely share the views of the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade that the clauses are alien to the Bill. I hold that our statutes should be so framed that they can be easily determined; they should not contain cross references which only lead to confusion, and therefore a Bill dealing with company law ought not to contain legislation affecting chemists, who are subject to a different Act of Parliament. I therefore hope the House will agree to the omission of these clauses.

*COLONEL LONG (Worcestershire, Evesham) expressed the opinion that the reasons put forward by the President of the Board of Trade for the rejection of the clauses—namely, that they were not germane to the Bill—were not sufficiently strong to justify their omission. The object of the Bill was to do away with certain abuses in our system of trading by companies. Abuses were believed to exist by means of which people who were not qualified chemists and dentists carried on those businesses, to the danger of the public. The Lord Chancellor, who was supposed to understand evidence, had been convinced that such abuses did exist, and ought to be remedied, therefore he inserted the clauses, and they ought not to be thrown out on the weak grounds stated.

*SIR J. B. TUKE (Edinburgh and St. Andrews Universities) also regretted that Clause 3 was to be dropped, as its operation would have put a stop to practices which served to paralyse the action of the Medical Acts in certain important particulars. Under the law as it now stood persons in no way connected with the medical profession were able to form companies, the object of which was to act as physicians, surgeons, and dentists. Over such companies the Medical Council could exercise no jurisdiction, and one of the main objects of the Medical Acts was inoperative. The public were the sufferers, as it was rendered impossible to distinguish between qualified and non-qualified practitioners. He recognised that the clause was not germane to the general terms of the Bill, but he felt so strongly on the subject that next session he would take an early opportunity to introduce a Bill dealing with it.

Question put, and negatived.

MR. MADDISON (Sheffield, Brightside): I beg to move the omission of Clause 3. I can only express my satisfaction that the President of the Board of Trade has agreed to the omission of this clause.

Question, that Clause 3 stand part of the Bill, put and negatived.

MR. ATHERLEY-JONES (Durham, N.W.): I have to move the omission from Clause 4 of the following words—

"(ii) either signed the Memorandum of Association for a number of shares not less than his qualification (if any) or signed and filed with the registrar a contract in writing to take from the company and pay for his qualification shares (if any)."

The law as it at present stands requires that a director of a company shall qualify for his position by taking up the number of shares defined in the Articles of Association. It is not unusual, I believe, for directors of companies to receive their qualifications from the promoters, and if I understand the object of the right hon. Gentleman aright, it is, by including this clause in the Bill, to prevent directors of companies from receiving their qualifications from the promoters. In other words, he desires to deal with that class of directors described as "guinea-pig" directors. But the Bill will not effect that object, because I observe that, by a later clause, on page 8, there is a provision that the director is to make a statement "of all sums paid or agreed to be paid to him in cash or shares by any person, either to qualify him as a director or otherwise, for services rendered by him in connection with the formation of the company." Therefore, I take it, the very evil which this clause is intended to defeat is countenanced and regulated by a subsequent clause. I agree that very considerable evil attaches to the provision of qualifications for directors. There are two grounds for resisting the inclusion of this clause in the Bill. The first is that it does not attain the object in view, because it is quite possible to have an elusive arrangement with intending directors to defeat the object aimed at by this provision. But the second is a far more important reason. Suppose a man is invited to serve on a board, and he is to receive a salary, by way of director's fees, of £200 a year. He may be a peer of the realm, a Member of Parliament, an ex-Governor General, or some other more or less distinguished personage. His qualification is to be £200, and it is obvious that he will have no difficulty in finding it, for he is not going to deprive himself of this opportunity of earning £200 a year. It will, therefore, be perfectly easy for him to enter into an arrangement of a nature which it will not be necessary to disclose. Another very forcible reason is that you are making a law which you cannot effectively enforce. It is most desirable that obvious acts of misconduct in connection with the formation and maintenance of companies should, as far as possible, be checked by legislation. But if you lay down a moral law which it is impossible effectively to enforce, you at once bring your legislation into contempt, and you defeat the very object which you have in view. On the ground that these words are calculated to produce further elusive acts of fraud, and to accentuate the evil which it is desired to suppress, I beg to move the omission of these words.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 19, to leave out paragraph (ii.), of Sub-section (1), of Clause 4."—(*Mr. Atherley-Jones.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out to the word 'for,' in line 19, stand part of the Bill."

MR. RITCHIE: The object of this sub-section is clear. It is to secure that under all circumstances, and in all cases, a director shall qualify himself, and shall not receive his qualification from anyone else. I imagine it is quite possible, if the qualification is £200, and he is to receive a salary of £200 a year, for a man to qualify himself by taking shares to the extent of £200. But I do think it a wise thing that gentlemen who put themselves forward as directors of companies should give some security that they have an interest in the company, and should provide themselves with the necessary shares and pay for them. If the hon. Gentleman's Amendment is accepted that security will be done away with.

MR. ATHERLEY-JONES: What about Clause 12?

MR. PERKS (Lincolnshire, Louth): The object of the clause is a highly desirable one, seeing that it is to secure that the director shall not be a mere bogus creature, but that he shall have a substantial interest in the company. That is manifestly a good idea. But still it seems to me it is obvious that if a company which is a reprehensible company desires to have upon its directorate any particular class of person it will be able to secure its object by the simple expedient of reducing the qualification to a nominal amount. I do not think the clause will have the effect anticipated in the case of an unsubstantial or questionable company, but still it would be as well that the words should be retained as some protection against the impecunious or "guinea-pig" director.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton) said it did not appear to him that it was possible to secure that a director should pay for his own shares. He might borrow the necessary money on the understanding that it should be paid back out of his fees as director. In fact, he might get over the difficulty in a hundred different ways. But the object of the clause, as he understood it, was to secure that the public should know how many shares each director had. It seemed to him, although he very much doubted whether the clause would afford any real security against the directors obtaining their qualification from promoters, it would be an advantage to the public that they should know how many shares each particular director held.

MR. ATHERLEY-JONES: I beg to ask leave to withdraw my Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. H. S. FOSTER (Suffolk, Lowestoft) said he desired to move the omission from the same section of the words "for a number of shares not less than his qualification." He took it that the object of his right hon. friend was not to deter good men from coming forward as directors, but he feared that this particular provision might act as a deterrent unless his Amendment was accepted. A gentleman might be asked to join a board of directors, and this section required that he should take up his qualifying shares at a time when he did not know whether or not the company would go to allotment. The qualification might be £500, and he might be willing to subscribe that amount conditionally that the company went to allotment. But this clause required that he should pay it down, whether the company went to allotment or not. What would be the result? In the case of a company which was registered but did not go to allotment a wrecking solicitor might be tempted to petition for a winding-up order, as he would be sure of his costs, because he would have a number of directors to go against, each of whom would be liable to the amount of his qualifying shares. The effect must be to deter good men from taking any responsibility in the initial stages of a company, whereas he took it that one of the chief objects of the President of the Board of Trade was to secure that good men should become connected with a company at its very inception.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 19, to leave out the words from the word 'association,' to the word 'or,' in line 20."—(*Mr. H. S. Foster.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

MR. RITCHIE said he had no reason to find fault with his hon. friend for putting the Amendment on the Paper. What was wanted was that everybody should know what a director's qualification was. He was afraid that whatever risk a director had to run as to whether or not the company would float or not, the director must be left to bear it. He did not think that any inconvenience such as his hon. friend suggested had ensued from the present state of the law, which put directors in the same position in regard to qualifying shares. All that was wanted was that the directors should really take and pay for the necessary qualifying shares.

SIR ROBERT REID (Dumfries Burghs) said he would agree with the hon. Gentleman if he thought that the Bill as it stood would produce the consequences the hon. Gentleman feared. But he would point out that it was not obligatory on the director to sign the Memorandum of Association; he might sign and file with

the registrar a contract in writing to take and pay for the qualifying shares. If the proposed director was under any apprehension such as was referred to by the hon. Gentleman, he was at liberty to take the second alternative.

MR. TOMLINSON (Preston) thought the clause as it stood might deter useful men from becoming directors.

Question put, and agreed to.

*MR. SYDNEY GEDGE (Walsall) hoped that the President of the Board of Trade would accept the Amendment he now proposed. Suppose the prospectus was for the issue of debentures only, and all the shares had been already subscribed, it would be impossible for a large shareholder to become a director to have his name in the prospectus unless, in addition to the shares he had already got, he were to sign and register a contract to take the qualification shares from the company, though it had none to sell.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 22, at the end, to insert the words, 'or a certificate signed by the secretary or acting secretary of the company that he is the registered holder of his qualification shares, if any.'"—(*Mr. Sydney Gedge.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. RITCHIE said there was a very great difference between the alternative which his hon. friend asked the House to accept and Sub-section 2 of Clause 4. That sub-section endeavoured to secure—whether it would be effective for the purpose or not time only would show—that the proposed director should enter into a contract to take and pay for his qualifying shares. If the Amendment were accepted, all that it would be necessary to do in order to comply with the provision would be for a qualified director or shareholder to transfer into the name of the proposed director certain qualifying shares. There was nothing in the Amendment to show that the qualifying shares should belong to the director, or that he had entered into a contract to buy them. He could not accept the Amendment.

Question put, and negatived.

MR. H. S. FOSTER, in moving the next Amendment, said that the all-important thing was the issue of the prospectus. The directors might not be appointed at the time of the registration of the Memorandum and Articles of Association.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 24, after the word 'company,' to insert the words 'or of the prospectus.'"—(*Mr. H. S. Foster.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR ROBERT FINLAY submitted that the House ought not to accept the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 30, to leave out the word 'passing,' and insert the word 'commencement.'"—(*Mr. H. S. Foster.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'passing' stand part of the Bill."

MR. RITCHIE could not see that there was any hardship in applying this portion of the Bill to a company registered before the passing into law instead of at 1st January, 1901.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*MR. SYDNEY GEDGE said the Amendment he now moved would carry out what must be the intention of the Government in Clause 4. "Does" could only relate to the moment of registering, and an invitation given a few days later would defeat the object. He desired to secure it by exchanging something definite for what was vague.

Amendment proposed —

"In page 2, line 31, to leave out the words 'does not issue,' and insert the words 'is prohibited by its memorandum or articles of association from issuing.'"—(*Mr. Sydney Gedge.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'does not issue' stand part of the Bill."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs) said the section was introduced for the protection of the public in cases where a company went to the public asking subscriptions for shares. He did not see what the object of the Amendment was.

MR. PERKS said this was a most important question to the investing public. They must not forget that they were dealing with £1,500,000,000 of money invested in this country, and it was very important that they should have some definition or explanation from the authors of the Bill as to what was meant by invitation to the public. Many hon. Members had not had the opportunity of listening to the discussions in the Grand Committee, and they were hopelessly ignorant of what was the meaning of the phrase.

*MR. MARKS (Tower Hamlets, St. George's) said the portion of the Bill now under consideration dealt with certain things which were to be done before the registration of the articles, and the provision that this particular section should not apply to any company which did not issue an invitation to the public suggested three or four varying and conflicting possibilities. It was impossible to issue an invitation to the public before registration, and there was no period set at which the company was to issue an invitation, if an invitation was to be issued. The suggestion which the section conveyed to his mind was that these formalities were to be complied with before registration, when it was obviously impossible for the company, even if it intended to issue an invitation to the public, to do so, and there was no provision that they might go back to the registrar later on for the purpose of complying with the formalities. There was another point. There seemed to be an idea in the mind of the hon. Gentleman the Attorney General, that the shares which reached the public, and in respect of which there was a general desire that every care and precaution should be taken, were those taken by the public in response to a magical appeal called "invitation to the public." Nothing of the kind was the case. In a large number of cases where investors had lost heavily by abortive enterprises there had been no such thing as an invitation to the public to subscribe, nor had there been any necessity for it. What was done, and what this Bill did not prevent from being done, was this—a company was formed without even such safeguards as were provided by the publication of a prospectus. A company was formed in a hole and corner way by a promoter and a few others, and the shares were allotted to the promoter's nominees. A pool of these shares was then made, and the services of a few highly respectable jobbers were engaged in order to have the shares floated on the Stock Exchange—one lot at £1, the next at £2, and the next at £3. No prospectus was issued which could be produced in court, but perambulating prospectuses were employed in the form of joint stock promoters or jobbers who gave inspired tips that the shares were going to £4 or £5. Frequently they did go to £4 or £5. The prices were matters of public record. It was thus that great transactions were carried out. The very company which this Bill would exempt from every safeguard was the company in respect of which the public most required protection—the company whose directors floated the concern, which had no prospectus, because they issued no invitation to the public. So far as this clause was concerned it was rendered nugatory by the provision of Sub-section 3. It was precisely that company to which the section should apply. It was precisely that company in respect of which the public wished to be protected, the company whose shares were bought by the public at a high premium. They could always trust the investor to invest unwisely, and to wish afterwards to wreak his vengeance on somebody. In the present state of the law the investor could still invest unwisely, and, having lost his money he was at a loss to discover the director responsible for the prospectus, or even to ascertain the office of the company in which he had lost his money. If some limit were put to the period during which a company would have the option of deciding whether or not an invitation to the public should be issued, there might be something to be said for this sub-section; but as it stood it was useless. It was apparently senseless, but it would be less senseless if the Amendment of his hon. and learned friend were accepted; but he was by no means sure that it would be less useless.

SIR ROBERT REID said his regret was that this Bill did not deal with the making of a market in company shares, and did not, therefore, deal with one of the greatest vices or frauds which were common in company promotion. As far as the particular Amendment under con-

sideration was concerned, he did not think they need trouble to go into the question. But the question was, whether the clause was to have a wide or a comparatively restricted application. The Government proposed that the clause should not apply in the case of companies which did not issue an invitation to the public. That was rather wide. Though he did not attach very much importance to the clause, and though he did not think it would have so great a beneficial effect as the Government hoped, at the same time it was a good clause so far as it went. He wished to have it as widely applied as possible, and, therefore, for that reason he should support the Amendment proposed by the hon. Gentleman. He would ask the Government whether they might not accede to it.

MR. MCLAREN (Leicestershire, Bosworth) said he thought the intention was that the clause should not apply to private firms which were registered as limited liability companies, and which divided the capital amongst the partners of the concerns. If that was the intention of the Bill, surely some form of words might be found which would clearly express that intention, so as to prevent inconvenience arising from the rather loose wording of the clause as it stood. All they had to do if they wished to evade the penal section was that somebody should say it was not intended to issue shares to the public. The directors might pass a resolution to that effect, and after an interval of eight or nine months a prospectus might be issued when it would be absolutely too late to apply Sub-section 1. The clause as it stood would open the door to every kind of evasion, and if it had any meaning at all would lead to endless litigation.

*SIR ALBERT ROLLIT (Islington, S.) said he very much doubted whether it was possible to draw a logical or legal distinction between the two classes of companies—namely, public and private companies. This subject was, however, very much discussed in the Departmental Committee, and he thought the general feeling was that a distinction should be drawn if possible. He reminded the House of the concluding words of the Report of the Committee bearing on that subject. They said—

"It must, however, be admitted that the distinction between the two classes is rather dangerous ground, and affords a possible loop hole for evasion."

Whatever the law might provide, the real difficulty of the position was that described by the hon. Member for St. George's. He agreed with him that there was a great deal more danger in a private undertaking where a memorandum or circular was issued than there was in connection with a concern which was made public and became the subject of public criticism in the press and elsewhere. For his own part, he thought the section was one which would not be found to serve a practical purpose. The danger foreshadowed by the Committee would probably take place. They had a choice between two forms of words, and the ex-Attorney General preferred the wider form of words. For himself, however, the wider form of words, he concluded, was the one which said that the thing should not be done. Although he agreed to a large extent with the hon. Member who moved the Amendment, he thought after all, the attempt at definition should be based on the words of the Bill rather than the words of the Amendment.

MR. HALDANE (Haddingtonshire) said he did not think the evil which would be incurred by widening the words was at all to be compared with the evil of keeping them narrow. What did it matter whether this clause was made applicable to a private company or not? All those who had to do with the evils of joint stock company promotion knew that every year developed a new kind of evil. There was the evil connected with the prospectus, and this Bill seemed a little inadequate to deal with that matter. It was a common practice for a dozen persons to promote a company, to form it, to take shares in it, to enter into a pooling agreement, and to appoint half a dozen brokers. The intention was that such a company should become a public company, though the prospectus did not contemplate this form at all. To such a company as that the provisions of this clause should apply, and he saw no reason to think that any serious injury or inconvenience would be caused to anyone. If they got a simple and plain provision which would cover all such cases, he hoped it would prove more efficacious than provisions with similar benevolent objects had proved in the past.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL (Sir EDWARD CARSON, Dublin University) said he did not think the matter under discussion was really of first-rate importance. This clause had been inserted in the Bill at the suggestion of a number of hon. Members on the Committee who desired as far as possible not to interfere with *bona fide* private companies. Those who spoke on behalf of private companies urged that in these cases the public had no concern, and that it was not necessary to know what the qualifications of the directors were, or whether they had subscribed or not. If the Amendment of the hon. and learned Gentlemen were carried it would put an end to the sub-section altogether. As the Government were anxious to interfere as little as possible with *bona fide* private companies, he hoped the House would reject the Amendment.

MR. LABOUCHERE said there were many private companies wholly respectable, but we had to deal with a great many companies that were turned into public companies, and which were frauds from the beginning. An arrangement was made with a large number of brokers who received £1 shares at 10s. or 12s. They had the option of taking them at that price and selling them to the public at £1 or more. It really seemed to him preposterous where they were dealing with public companies that they should make the proposal in the clause. Though it might be annoying to certain gentlemen who wished to turn their business into companies to face this publicity, it was a smaller evil than to allow the public to be swindled in these matters with impunity. It would do very little harm to allow these documents to go before Somerset House; but if the Committee left these *quasi*-private companies to carry out their arrangements this measure would do no good. We should have a greater number of *quasi*-private companies, and it was most difficult for the public to know anything of these private companies. There was more swindling in these than in the companies brought out by prospectuses.

MR. WALLACE (Perth) said he objected to the words as they stood in the Bill, and still more to the Amendment which the hon. Member for Walsall proposed to insert. There was no reason whatever why private companies should not come under the section as it stood. There was no hardship inflicted on a private company in requiring that the directors should have their names registered at the time of the formation of the company.

SIR THOMAS LEA (Londonderry, S.) said a very large proportion of the manufacturing trade of this country was done by private limited companies who did not appeal to the public at all. The hon. Member who had just spoken asked why private companies should not come under a section of this sort. Where were they to draw the line? The result would be that private limited companies would come under the whole of the provisions of the Bill, and it would be against the trade of the country and detrimental to the manufacturing and industrial interests.

MR. BRYCE said he hoped the Government would make up its mind to accept the Amendment moved by the hon. Member for Walsall. It was not intended that any hardship should be inflicted on private companies by subjecting them to the provisions of Clause 4. It had not been denied that the evils of bringing out these companies without a prospectus were very grave and serious, and under the circumstances he thought the best course would be to omit the words.

MR. BOND (Nottingham, E.): I think the point might be met by a device with which all people who are cognisant of company law are perfectly familiar. The reason private companies object to being brought under the clause is that the object of the clause is to make directors pay for their shares in cash. They might enter into a contract to take these shares or file with the registrar an undertaking that they are willing to take these shares. That would be obviously inconvenient in the case of a private company, because probably the whole of the capital of the company would be divided, if not amongst the directors themselves, amongst the directors and a few other people. The directors have a very large number of shares, and probably, if any qualification is mentioned in the Articles of Association, it is a very large qualification. But they do not get these shares by purchase; they get them as part-proprietors of the

business. The object, I take it, is to prevent gentlemen in that position from being saddled with the obligation to buy shares, there being none in the market. That difficulty would be got over if each of the directors signed the Memorandum for one share only, and if one share was made in the Articles the qualification of a director. That would not in any way injure the business, because we are assuming the business to be a private one, confined to a small number of people, the shares in which are put forward before the public for subscription. I think, therefore, the best plan is to leave out the words and put nothing in their place.

SIR JAMES JOICEY (Durham, Chester-le-Street) knew of many companies in the north of England which had prohibitions upon the sale of their shares outside the particular family interested in the business, and he was afraid that many Members did not realise that there were numbers of companies in regard to which no cash payment whatever took place. The shares were simply divided amongst the family interested in the concern, and it was unreasonable to expect those people to make all their affairs public. At the same time, the clause was not at all clear. There were words which nobody could really explain, and the only way in which they would be explained would be by litigation, whereas it was the duty of the House, whenever possible, to avoid causes of litigation. Attention had been called to the particular words "issuing any invitation to the public." It was impossible to construe those words, and there were many others of the same character. There had not been a Bill passed for some years likely to give rise to so much litigation as the present Bill. Every clause would have to be construed by the courts. The Government in pressing the measure in its present form were not acting wisely either in their own interests or in the interests of the country. It would really be better, after the discussion which had taken place, that the Government should withdraw the Bill and bring forward another measure dealing with the matter in a much better way.

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 168 ; Noes, 109. (Division List No. 234.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Allsopp, Hon. George
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Baillie, James E. B. (Inverness)
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Barnes, Frederic Gorell
Bartley, George C. T.
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H (Bristol)
Begg, Ferdinand Faithfull
Bethell, Commander
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boulnois, Edmund
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Bowles, T Gibson (King's Lynn
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brown, Alexander H.
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Glasgw
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir. Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbys.
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Hertford, East)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm
Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chelsea, Viscount
Coddington, Sir William
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Cooke, C. W. Radcliffe (Herefd
Cross, H. Shepherd (Bolton)
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Curzon, Viscount
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, George Denison
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edwd.
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robt. Penrose-
Fitz Wygram, General Sir F.
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Fry, Lewis
Garfit, William
Gibbons, J. Lloyd
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H (Cit vof Lond.
Giles, Charles Tyrrell
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir J. Eldon
Goschen, Rt Hn G J (St George's)
Goschen, George J. (Sussex)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Gull, Sir Cameron
Halsey, Thomas Frederick
Hamilton, Rt. Hon. Lord Geo ge
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Healy, Maurice (Cork)
Helder, Augustus
Hermon-Hodge, R. Trotter
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel (Norwich)
Holland, William Henry
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Howard, Joseph
Howell, William Tudor
Hozier, Hon. Jas. Henry Cecil
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Lafone, Alfred
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Lawrence, Sir E. Durning-(Corn
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks.)
Lea, Sir Thomas (Londonderry)
Llewelyn, Sir Dillwyn-(Swans.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lopes, Henry Yarde Buller
Lowe, Francis William
Lowles, John
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas-Shadwell, William
Macartney, W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
Maclure, Sir John William
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)

M'Iver, Sir L. (Edinburgh, W.)
Malcolm, Ian
Maxwell, Rt. Hn. Sir Herbert E
Mellor, Colonel (Lancashire)
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore, J. Throgmorton
Milward, Colonel Victor
Monk, Charles James
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morrison, Jas. A. (Wilts, S.)
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)
Muntz, Philip A.
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nicol, Donal Ninian
O'Connor, Arthur (Donegal)
Pease, Herb. Pike (Darlington)
Percy, Earl
Phillpotts, Captain Arthur
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plunkett, Rt. Hon. Horace C.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Rentoul, James Alexander
Richardson, Sir T. (Hartlep'l)
Ridley, Rt. Hon. Sir M. W.
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. C. Thomson
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel W.
Russell, T. W. (Tyrone)
Sandon, Viscount
Savory, Sir Joseph
Seely, Charles Hilton
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spencer, Ernest
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edw. Jas. (Somerset)
Stanley, Sir H. M. (Lambeth)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Sutherland, Sir Thomas
Thornton, Percy M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Welby, Lt-Col. A. C. E. (Tauntn
Wharton, Rt. Hn. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-under-L.
Williams, Jos. Powell- (Birm.
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wilson-Todd, W. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham George
Young, Commander (Berks, E.
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Sir William Walrond and
Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allison, Robert Andrew
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Austin, M. (Limerick, W.)
Baker, Sir John
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Augustine
Blake, Edward
Bond, Edward
Bramsdon, Thomas Arthur
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carvill, Patrick G. Hamilton
Channing, Francis Allston
Clark, Dr. G. B.
Courtney, Rt. Hon. L. H.
Crilly, Daniel
Crombie, John William
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Duckworth, James
Dunn, Sir William
Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Evans, Sir F. H. (Southampton)
Fenwick, Charles
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fox, Dr. Joseph Francis
Gedge, Sydney
Gladstone, Rt. Hon. Herb. J.
Gourley, Sir E. Temperley
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Grey, Sir Edward (Berwick)
Haldane, Richard Burdon
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Healy, Timothy M. (N. Louth)
Hedderwick, Thomas Chas. H.
Hogan, James Francis
Horniman, Frederick John
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
Labouchere, Henry
Langley, Batty
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cumberl'd.
Lough, Thomas
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macaleese, Daniel
MacDonnell, Dr M A (Queen's C
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall
M'Dermott, Patrick
M'Ghee, Richard
M'Hugh, Patrick A. (Leitrim)
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin
M'Leod, John
Maddison, Fred.
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Marks, Henry Hananel
Mather, William
Mendl, Sigismund Ferdinand
Morgan, W. Pritchard (Merthyr
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Oldroyd, Mark
O'Malley, William
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Perks, Robert William
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pilkington, Sir G. A. (Lancs S W.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Reid, Sir Robert Threshie
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Samuel, J. (Stockton-on-Tees)
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire)
Spicer, Albert
Stanhope, Hon. Philip J.
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Edward
Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)
Sullivan, T. D. (Donegal, W.)
Tanner, Charles Kearns
Tennant, Harold John
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Walton, J. Lawson (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wedderburn, Sir William
Whiteley, George (Stockport)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wills, Sir William Henry
Wilson, Charles Henry (Hull)
Wilson, Hy. J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, John (Govan)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Robert Wallace and
Mr. Hazell.

*MR. SYDNEY GEDGE said that Sub-section 6, to which his Amendment referred, was not in the Bill, but on the white paper under his name. As the Bill stood no allotment of any share capital could be made unless certain conditions were complied with. The provision was intended to prevent a company starting with a totally insufficient capital, and to prevent people having shares allotted to them when the capital was entirely insufficient. Suppose a company asked for a capital of

£500,000 and they only obtained £400,000 or £450,000, while by throwing over some part of their undertaking they might proceed to carry on business with £450,000. Applicants might have applied for shares on the understanding that £500,000 would be subscribed, but if all of them were willing to take their shares and go on he saw no reason why they should be prohibited from doing so. If they liked to commence business with £450,000, why should they not do so? As the Bill stood they would have to wind up that company and go through the whole process again, and they would be put to great expense. With the object of leaving them free to do what they liked with their own, and proceed with a diminished capital if they thought fit, he proposed later on to move to insert at the end of Clause 6 the following words, which, with the permission of the Speaker, he would read—

"Provided always, that nothing herein contained shall prevent the allotment of shares to any applicant who, after having received notice in writing from the company that the minimum subscription has not been obtained, shall have consented in writing to take allotment of the shares subscribed by him or any less number, and whenever any allotment shall have been so made by consent, notice thereof shall be given forthwith to the registrar, and the total number of shares comprised in such allotments and notice shall be the minimum subscription for the purposes of section eight of this Act."

There would be very full notice given, and everybody would know exactly what he was doing. He submitted to the Government and to the House that there could be no reason why, because the subscriptions had fallen short, that the whole thing should come to an end, all the expense be thrown away, and the parties sent home without being able to join in the undertaking which they desired to promote. He begged to move the Amendment standing in his name.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 16, after the word 'allotment,' to insert the words 'save as provided by sub-section six of this section.'"—(*Mr. Sydney Gedge.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. RITCHIE: I hope the House will not consent to the Amendment of my hon. friend. The House has already given its assent to a proposition that at the formation of these companies the public should be informed as to what is the minimum amount which the directors consider they require to proceed with. Whatever may be the amount of the capital, the directors have to say what, in their opinion, is the smallest amount they can go to allotment upon, which means that they have decided that that amount of capital is required for carrying on the business. My hon. friend desires to drive a coach and four through the provision which has already been assented to by the House, and say that, in the case of this minimum subscription not being reached, the company may proceed to business on a lesser sum than the minimum provided. I do not think we ought to proceed in that way. I think we should not allow this minimum to be set aside simply because the shareholders desire to proceed on a smaller capital than what the directors say is necessary. The hon. Member has argued as if it was a question for shareholders only, but it is nothing of the kind, for it is a question for the creditors as well, and a company proceeding to allotment on a smaller capital is calculated, though not intentionally, to deceive the public. I trust the House will adhere to the clause as it stands.

MR. PERKS: This Amendment shows how delusive this provision is. First of all you are dealing, in the majority of cases, with perfectly capable and solvent companies which would not dream of going to allotment unless they had a sufficient amount of subscribed capital. It is not unfrequently the case that they state in the prospectus that that is the intention of the directors. I think the Board of Trade have been wisely advised in adopting some such provision as this. As I pointed out on Clause 4 in regard to the qualifications of directors, it is capable of being set aside by fixing in the Articles that the qualification should only be one share or a very nominal sum. Therefore, in connection with this supposed protection to the public of a minimum subscription, all that is necessary is for a joint stock company to state that the minimum subscription is to be a mere nominal figure. I know the answer will be that

at all events the public will have notice, nd I admit that that is a very good answer to a certain point. I wish, however, to point out the danger of grafting upon joint stock company laws a number of harassing and futile conditions, when it is perfectly well known that the cases of fraud which you are trying to protect the public against are only an infinitesimal proportion. There are a number of companies who do not need these harassing restrictions placed upon them, and I think that point ought be well borne in mind by the right hon. Gentleman. There is also another restriction about the amount of money which each shareholder has to pay on application; but there again, it is merely a nominal amount, which will not bring any substantial sum into the coffers of the company for the purpose of protecting the creditors, and this particular clause we are now considering is the passing of a minimum which will be perfectly fair.

SIR ALFRED HICKMAN (Wolverhampton, W.): The explanation is very simple. No man in his senses would subscribe to a company, the minimum subscription of which was placed at a merely nominal figure. We can never protect persons so silly as to do that, but that is no reason why we should not protect others.

SIR ALBERT ROLLIT: The evil which this clause strikes at is probably the very worst which has occurred in company administration, namely, proceeding to allotment on insufficient capital. The vendors and others receive their money, and then the company is left without sufficient assets to conduct its business. The clause is required, and I cannot concur with my hon. friend that it might be eluded by stating the nominal amount at which allotment would take place. What would the public think of a company with a nominal capital of £100,000, the directors of which proposed to proceed to allotment on £10? I should like the House, nevertheless, to consider whether my hon. friend the Member for Walsall has not introduced an Amendment which may have an advantageous effect. I admit at once the evil, and I think this clause provides a remedy. What form does the evil take? Why this, that the directors of a company at a meeting of the Board proceed to allotment without consulting the shareholders at all. They act independently of the shareholders, and that is a very great evil indeed. My hon. friend's Amendment provides that the directors shall take the shareholders into their confidence, and if the shareholders deliberately advise the directors to proceed to allotment on the capital subscribed, that is a fair and reasonable corollary to the clause. Suppose it was provided that £100,000 was the minimum, and that the subscription fell short of that amount by only £100, that would be an embarrassing situation, and a great deal of money would be lost, although it might be found quite practicable to deal with the company, with the assent of the shareholders. If a company in such a position had to be dissolved, the stamp duty and all the preliminary expenses would be lost. It may be said that this Amendment opens the door to abuse. I admit there may be cases in which it may be abused, but I think the principle of the Amendment is right—insufficient subscription by a small amount, the practical performance of every object by the company, and the directors acting, not of their own accord, but with the consent of the shareholders. I think it is a very strong proposal.

SIR ROBERT REID said he agreed with the President of the Board of Trade, and also with the observations which had been made with regard to the abuses which had arisen in proceeding to allotment on insufficient capital. He thought this clause would not produce very good results, partly for the reasons which had been already stated, and also because there was nothing to prevent collusive applications. That was a very common form of clause, but he thought a coach and six might be run through it by an ingenious company promoter. He felt that the clause would very likely prove of very small value.

SIR JAMES JOICEY said that if what he would call fraudulent promoters were allowed to go to allotment with a very small capital, they would probably make a market of the shares, as was done in cases where no prospectus was issued. He thought it would be unwise to accept the Amendment. After all, people did not go into a company because of the amount

of qualification which the directors held. They went into the company on the character of the directors.

Question put and negatived.

Amendment proposed,

"In Clause 6, page 3, line 17, to leave out 'for public,' and insert 'to the public for.'"—(*Mr. Ritchie.*)

Amendment agreed to.

MR. BOND, in moving the next Amendment, said it was not desirable to multiply formalities beyond what was necessary. He did not understand why the minimum subscription should be inserted both in the Memorandum or Articles of Association and in the prospectus. If the minimum subscription before proceding to allotment was stated in the prospectus, that was all that was necessary to protect the shareholders. People did not generally propose to take shares in a company unless they had the prospectus before them. The provision of the section was entirely new, and had never hitherto been seen in any Articles of Association.

Amendment proposed,

"In page 3, line 19, to leave out the words 'by the Memorandum or Articles of Association.'"—(*Mr. Bond.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

MR. RITCHIE said the question of capital was one of so important and vital a character in connection with the formation of a company that he thought it ought to be entered in something more than the prospectus. That was why it was thought that it ought to be definitely laid down that the minimum subscription which would entitle a company to go to allotment should be named in the Articles of Association as well as the prospectus.

MR. PERKS said the effect of putting it in the Articles of Association would be that it could be altered by special resolution. The effect of putting it in the Memorandum would be that it would be unalterable. The point was this—whether they should now agree that the amount of the minimum subscription should not only be in the Memorandum and Articles of Association as well as in the prospectus—three documents.

MR. RITCHIE: In the prospectus, and one or other of the other two.

MR. PERKS: Then, do I understand that it could only be in the prospectus?

MR. RITCHIE: It must be in the prospectus, and it must be incorporated in one of the other two—either in the Memorandum or the Articles of Association, not in both.

MR. PERKS: Very often in the incorporation of a company in the first instance it was impossible to say what was the amount of the minimum capital it would be wise to go to allotment on. Very often when the Articles of Association and the Memorandum were registered for the purchase of a large number of companies—in many cases in the incorporation of banks, and particularly in the case of the Amalgamation of large industrial concerns—it was almost impossible to say how much it would be wise to fix the minimum subscription at.

Question put, and agreed to.

Other Amendments made.

MR. RITCHIE said the Amendment he now moved was to redeem a pledge he gave to the Grand Committee to amend Clause 6 so as to meet the case of the failure of any bank in which money received from applicants for shares was deposited.

Amendment proposed—

"In Clause 6, page 4, line 4, at end to insert 'from the expiration of the forty-eight days, provided that a director shall not be liable if he proves that the loss of the money was not due to any misconduct or negligence on his part.'"—(*Mr. Ritchie.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR ROBERT REID said he was not a member of the Grand Committee, and was not acquainted with any arrange-

ment come to in regard to this matter. It was a small matter, and therefore it was not worth while saying many words about it. Still he must say that the Amendment did not commend itself to his sense of equity. If directors took from subscribers sums of money which they were pledged to return if the minimum allotment was not subscribed, it seemed to him that they should be under such obligation to restore it that they would be quite certain that it was in custody where it would be absolutely safe. He would not waste the time of the Committee in pressing the matter, for loss in this way was very unlikely to occur often.

Question put, and agreed to.

*Mr. MARKS said there were provisions in Sub-section 6 which it would not be desirable to limit to the first allotment of shares. His object in moving the omission of the sub-section was for the purpose of calling attention to a grave defect in the Bill which was discussed in the Committee upstairs, and in respect of which he at least understood that it was to be dealt with at a later stage. By Sub-section 3 of the clause the amount payable on each share on application was 5 per cent. of the nominal amount of the share. The whole of the section did not apply to the allotment of shares subsequent to the first allotment. If there was a point on which the public and others familiar with joint stock companies had been unanimous since this Bill had been before the public it was that companies should not proceed to allotment with insufficient capital. The stock exchanges, the chambers of commerce, the Institute of Secretaries, the Registrar of Joint Stock Companies, and the Inspector-General in Bankruptcy were unanimous as to the extreme importance of not permitting companies, as far as the law could prevent them, to go to allotment with insufficient capital. The first condition of allotment on a sufficient capital was that there should be some guarantee that the applications were made in good faith, that they were not bogus applications, that they were not made for the purpose of carrying on stock market deals, and for the purpose of entrapping the unwary. Five per cent. was the smallest possible amount that should be paid on subscription. Small as it was, it was some guarantee of the good faith of the applicant. It created the impression at least that he was not altogether a man of straw. But if it was important in respect of the first allotment of shares that there should be some payment in cash on application, surely it was equally important that on the subsequent allotment of shares there should be some payment in cash. What was the situation created by Sub-section 6? It was this. There was an invitation to the promoter who desired to conduct his business dishonestly—and he assumed that, to a certain extent, this Bill was aimed at dishonest promoters—there was a direct invitation to make the first issue of shares a formal issue. In connection with that issue he had to obey the injunction laid down in the section, but in respect of that first issue only. It might be an issue of 10,000 shares, and it might be worth while to provide 5 per cent. on application, and therefore, so far as the 10,000 shares were concerned, there was a genuine subscription. Having once complied with the law in connection with that purely formal first issue, he was at liberty to ignore all the safeguards contained in that clause. He was at liberty a month or three months after, or at any time, to issue 190,000 shares to the public, and he was not obliged to observe any of the obligations laid down. What was more significant in respect of that subsequent issue was that he was not required to make any amount payable in cash on application. It was infinitely more important that there should be a payment on application in the case of the subsequent issues than in the case of the first issue. He begged to move the omission of the clause.

Another Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 8, to leave out Sub-section 6 of Clause 6."—(*Mr. Marks.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out to the word 'for,' in line 9, stand part of the Bill."

Sir ROBERT FINLAY said his hon. friend admitted that the greater part of this provision would be quite inapplicable except to the first allotment. With regard to subsequent applications to the public to take shares, a certain protection was

given in Clause 6, Sub-section 6, which dealt with the starting of companies. He did not undervalue what his hon. friend had said with regard to subsequent issues to the public, but surely the greater part of the fraud which they had to deal with had been connected with what was termed "proceeding to allotment." He asked his hon. friend not to press his Amendment, but rest content with the fact that they had dealt with the case which was most prevalent.

SIR ROBERT REID: I think the hon. Member has shown by his criticism the weakness of the whole case. Let me give an illustration from the Report of the Board of Trade. A company named Vimbos had a prospectus with most excellent names for directors and solicitors. The sum of £165,000 was offered for subscription, and the public subscribed £535. There was £44,500 underwritten by bogus subscribers. The company went into liquidation, and it was a downright swindle from beginning to end, and this was only one of many of the kind. In this case it was the original application for shares; but as the hon. Member has pointed out, there might have been an original application of a perfectly formal character; and I will undertake to say that this formal application, when this Bill is passed, will become a matter of course, and this swindle might still be perpetrated. What the learned Attorney General has said is quite true, as the hon. Member himself admits—that a considerable part of this clause is not applicable in its terms and forms to anything but the first application for shares; but Sub-section 3 and Sub-section 5 might be left out, and instead of omitting the whole of Sub-section 6 there might be inserted after the word "section" the words "except Sub-sections 3 and 5." That would at least preserve for second applications some of the very small benefits which are conferred by this section. I have nothing more to say in regard to this point; but it is quite clear from the way the clause is drawn that you cannot retain the benefit of the whole of the clause for every application for shares. That is, to my mind, one of the great defects of this Bill, because it does not make any provision for that at all; but by moving the Amendment in the form I suggest it might do some good, and make the exception a little wider.

SIR JAMES JOICEY: This only shows the difficulty which arises in every part of this Bill. Supposing this Amendment is accepted, where are you placing yourself in the case of a company which was incorporated twenty years ago, and finds it necessary to issue more capital? Possibly the minimum amount upon which to go to allotment would have to be stated in the Articles of Association or the Memorandum. If it was stated in the Memorandum it could not be altered. I do not see, if this Amendment were accepted, how you could issue other shares and still comply with the Memorandum fixing the minimum on which you should go to allotment. So far as I know, I think it would alter altogether the working of this clause if the Amendment were accepted. I know a most prosperous company in the north of England which has just issued £750,000. It was incorporated twenty years ago, and if this Bill had been in operation without the section to which the hon. Gentleman opposite objects, then I do not see how they could have complied with the Act at all in their second allotment of shares.

*MR. LAWSON WALTON: I hope the House will adopt the Amendment of my hon. friend the Member for St. George's. Some restriction is sought to be put upon the lodging of bogus capital, but a limit of 5 per cent. upon application money is a very small amount. A concrete case will show what it means. Supposing it is desired by a small syndicate to get a capital of £100,000. It will be necessary to subscribe £5,000, and by providing this sum amongst themselves they may get into their hands the whole of the shares, and by a judicious pooling arrangement and sales on the Stock Exchange they may put the shares on the market at a very large premium. This abuse is inadequately dealt with by the machinery of the Bill. You will have, in every case of speculative and fraudulent companies, two issues. You will have a formal issue and allotment, and you will have an effective issue and allotment. The formal issue will necessarily be a small one, because 5 per cent. of it must be subscribed by the persons who take the shares. Suppose it is said in

the prospectus that the company is to have a capital of £500,000 in shares. The first and formal allotment under the machinery of this Act will probably be an allotment of £25,000. In this case the provision of the clause will have been most scrupulously observed. The first issue on allotment having been made, and the company duly registered, the second and effective allotment will then proceed to be made, and the persons who subscribed for the shares with hands entirely free from all the fetters which this Act imposes will proceed to practise the arts of speculative company promoters. I hope that the right hon. Gentleman will look upon this Amendment with a little more favour.

MR. RITCHIE: It has been admitted on all hands that the clause as it stands would be inapplicable in many respects to second issues. I think my hon. and learned friend has failed to notice the effect of Sub-section D in Clause 12, which provides—

"The minimum subscription on which the directors may proceed to allotment, and the amount payable on application and allotment on each share; and in the case of a second or subsequent offer of shares, the amount offered for subscription on each previous allotment, and the amount actually allotted; and the amount, if any, paid on such shares."

Surely that would entirely meet the case which the hon. and learned Member suggests.

MR. BOUSFIELD (Hackney, N.): I hope the Government will give further consideration to the modified form of the Amendment suggested by the hon. and learned Member opposite. The five per cent. payable on application is a very small matter, and I have no doubt that the hon. Member who has moved this Amendment would be quite willing to accept the suggestion which has been made if the Government could see their way to except Sub-sections 3 and 5. I think this small concession would meet the views of the House.

MR. RITCHIE: I will agree to that.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Other Amendments made.

Mr. Lawson Walton.

*MR. LAWSON WALTON: I hope the right hon. Gentleman will see his way to allow some little modification of Subclause 2, Section 7. The section runs—

"If any director of a company knowingly contravenes or permits or authorises the contravention of any of the foregoing provisions of this Act with respect to allotment he shall be liable to compensate the company and the allottee respectively for any loss, damages, or costs which the company or the allottee may have sustained or incurred thereby."

So that the liability of the director is to compensate any person who has sustained a loss in consequence of that contravention. Now, the proviso is—

"Provided that proceedings to recover such loss, damages, or costs shall not be commenced after the expiration of one year from the date of the allotment."

I think I shall be supported by the House if I say so brief a limitation attached to a civil liability is almost unknown to our law. The House will see that the director sought to be affected is one who has knowingly contravened the provisions of the Act. The remedy is not given against a neglectful or indifferent director, but a director who knowingly contravenes the Act of Parliament. Now, I submit to the House that this director is far too leniently treated, because after the expiration of one year from the date of allotment, however flagrant his contravention may be, he escapes scot free. That is far too indulgent to the director who knowingly contravenes the statute. Again, the period within which the remedy is to be enforced is far too short for the person suffering loss. He has only twelve months in which to discover the loss and the breach of duty which caused the loss, and to institute proceedings for the recovery occasioned by the loss. All this is to be done in twelve months. If one looks at the analogous periods in this and other statutes it will be found a very much longer limit is allowed. Under Section 6, Subsection 4, there is no period fixed; therefore, I take it, the directors may be compelled to repay the allotment money within six years, inasmuch as in similar circumstances, under the Directors Liability Act of 1890, the Court of Appeal recently decided that an action may be brought any time within six years. In both these cases you have to deal with a defendant whose liability arises from carelessness or indifference. In that case

a director who causes the prospectus to be issued without having reasonable ground for believing it is true, is liable for six years; but in this case we have a favoured director, who escapes all liability after the expiration of one year from the date of allotment. I fail to see any ground for that exceptional treatment, and, therefore, I say if a limitation is to be allowed at all, that period should not commence until the person complaining has found out that the breach of duty has been committed. If my Amendment is accepted the section will run—

"provided that proceedings to recover such loss, damages, or costs shall not be commenced after the expiration of one year from the date at which the fault complained of may, by reasonable diligence, have been discovered."

The person complaining then will have to use the utmost diligence, because he has only a year to do it in. These derelictions of duty are never discovered for some time, because those who contravene the Statute always take very good care to cover up their traces.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 24, to leave out the words 'of the allotment,' and insert the words 'at which the default complained of might by reasonable diligence have been discovered by the persons seeking compensation.'"—(*Mr. Lawson Walton.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: I hope the House will not accept this Amendment, for this reason. It is very desirable, so far as we can, to make the period of limitation definite. I am quite aware that in certain cases it is necessary to have the statutory period dependent upon knowledge of the fraud. Still, as a general principle, it is desirable to have a definite time from which the statutory liability is to run, and not to say "from the time when the plaintiff might have reasonably discovered the fraud," which would open the door to a great many things which would not be desirable. There are other objections, if one looks at the section, to the form of this Amendment. In the ordinary course of things these irregularities would be found out at the statutory meeting of the company, if not sooner; but if the period of limitation is considered too short, and if it will be accepted, to save discussion we would consent to its being made two years instead of one.

MR. HALDANE pointed out that the arguments of the Attorney General would have been of great force had they been introducing a period of limitation of liability in the case of the indifference or neglect of a director, but in this case their limitation was directed against directors who "knowingly" contravened the Statute. He was not sure as to these irregularities being discovered at the date of the statutory meeting. Some things would not be discovered until the company had gone some way in its history. This clause was for the purpose of protecting innocent persons against directors who knowingly deceived them, and in limiting the period in this form, the Bill went a good deal further than the courts, which laid down the principle that the period of limitation should run from the date when the fraud was discovered.

MR. RITCHIE thought that the director had some claim to consideration, because all directors were not fraudulent. All contraventions of the Statute were not fraudulent. Nor had sufficient weight been given to the argument that an innocent director might have to undergo pains and penalties extending over an indefinite period if the Amendment was accepted. Although a man who was guilty of fraud deserved no consideration, the man who was charged only with fraud, did deserve consideration. The hon. and learned Gentleman looked at this question from a different standpoint from his. He could understand the ardour with which the hon. and learned Gentleman liked the shooting operation, but the person shot at did not like it, especially if the time during which he might be shot at was an indefinite period. For what might happen? The person who thought he was injured, and might subsequently come with an action against the director, might be content to lie quiet so long as the company was prosperous, but if there came a prospect of winding up, this same gentleman, who was quite prepared to submit to all these intolerable grievances while he was

receiving his 5 or 10 per cent. dividend, would come forward and say, "Good gracious, here is a prospect of my getting out of my liability; I will raise an action at once against the directors." There was no reason to make the period an indefinite one, but the Government was prepared to accept the extension to two years, and if that was accepted by hon. Members opposite, a step would have been taken towards settling one of the difficult points of this Bill.

MR. BRYCE said, as hon. Members were anxious to save time, and what was offered by the right hon. Gentleman opposite would be a substantial improvement in the Bill, he hoped the House would accept it.

SIR JAMES JOICEY expressed surprise that the Government should have accepted the extension of the limit of the two years. It appeared to him that anyone reading the clause must come to the conclusion that every director was expected to know the law in every detail, and that he was brought under the penalty of having to refund the capital of the company if he contravened the Act. From his experience, he could say that every board of directors that he was acquainted with had had to have their solicitors at their elbows in order that they might be told when they were contravening the Act or not. When one considered the liability which directors would take upon themselves when this Bill became an Act, he would be greatly surprised if any honest man, unless he was a fool, would submit to come under such provisions as these.

SIR ALFRED HICKMAN, supposing the case of a director dying, asked how his executors would ever be able to wind up his estate if it were to be subject to a liability of this kind for an indefinite period.

MR. HEDDERWICK (Wick Burghs) said that he did not understand the tenderness of the right hon. Gentleman towards a director who knowingly contravened the Statute.

MR. RITCHIE: I said distinctly I had no compassion for a director who did that, but that I had compassion for a director who was shot at who had not done so.

MR. HEDDERWICK said the clause showed undue tenderness towards these persons by limiting the liability to twelve months. There was no such limitation in Clause 6, under which an action at law would lie for six years, and the same principle ought to be applied to this clause. There was no reason for limiting the liability of a director who, in the words of the Bill, "knowingly contravenes or permits or authorises the contravention of any of the foregoing provisions of this Act with respect to allotment."

MR. LABOUCHERE said the President of the Board of Trade and those who supported him seemed to have a very curious idea as to what constituted honesty in a director. It was supposed to be something entirely different to that of any other human being, and laws were to be made to allow them to do things which other persons would not be allowed to do, in order to induce them to become directors. The clause said that if a director knowingly contravened the law, or permitted anybody else to do so, he was subject to certain penalties; but if his criminality remained undiscovered for twelve months, he was to be allowed to go scot free. They might as well say that if a director knowingly stole a watch, and the owner did not discover his loss in twelve months, the director should be allowed to go free. He protested against this doctrine of putting a premium on dishonesty, and against the idea that honest men would not become directors unless they were allowed to act dishonestly. He had no desire to treat a director worse than anybody else, but, on the other hand, he had no inclination to treat him better. Possibly a director might have an action brought against him after the expiration of a year, and the individual who brought it might not be able to prove his case; but everyone was liable to that, especially newspaper proprietors, and if this concession was to be made to company directors then newspaper proprietors should be included in it. As to the point raised by the hon. Member opposite as to a director dying, and whether there is any liability upon his executors, he could only say that if a director died

he might be let off, because in all probability he would be punished in another world; but so long as he was in this world let him remain liable to be punished if necessity arose.

MR. LAWSON WALTON begged leave to withdraw his Amendment in favour of that of the Attorney General.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Another Amendment made.

MR. PERKS begged leave to move the Amendment standing in the name of the hon. Member for North-west Durham. His object in doing so was to call attention to the clause, and to elicit from the Government some explanation with regard to it. The clause seemed to deprive the public of a protection which they had hitherto possessed, and the shareholders of the company of important rights which they had been accustomed to endow themselves with under their Articles of Association. The clause provided certain conditions under which the company might commence business. They had to satisfy the Joint Stock Registrar that they had complied with all the requisite conditions laid down for that purpose. The conditions were that the secretary of the company or one of the directors should make a statutory declaration on two points, and two points only. In the first place, he was to declare—and this was a condition precedent not merely to the commencement of the business, but also to the exercise of any borrowing powers of the company—that the minimum subscription had been provided by the applicants for the shares of the company, and that shares had been allotted to an amount not less in the whole than the minimum subscription. That was the first thing the secretary had to do before the company was launched to the world and commenced business. What was the other condition? It was that the director whose qualification had been specified in the preceding clause must pay to the company on each of the shares taken, or contracted to be taken by him, a proportion equal to the proportion payable on application and allotment on the shares offered for public subscription. Say that the limit on application would be something like 5 per cent., the director would have to subscribe 1s. per share on application and 1s. on allotment. Thereupon the secretary went to the Registrar of Joint Stock Companies, and made a statutory declaration and came out with a certificate—without, he presumed, any note or comment in it—that the company, which might be a perfectly bogus company, was entitled to commence business. But there was another condition in Sub-section 3 which was very extraordinary, and to his mind totally at variance with what was the ordinary course in limited companies. It was the usage that contracts made by a company before they were entitled to commence business were subject to confirmation by the shareholders.

MR. RITCHIE: That has nothing to do with the Amendment moved by the hon. Member, which is for the omission of Sub-section (*b*).

MR. PERKS said he would put himself in order by moving—as he was entitled to do—the omission of all the words from line 29, page 4, to line 9 on the next page. What he wanted to point out was that this clause was a direct premium given to launching bogus companies on the world with the imprimatur of a Government Department upon them. Directly this certificate was issued by this functionary on these illusory conditions, every contract which had been made before the company commenced business became absolutely binding, and not subject to the confirmation of the shareholders, however absurd or ruinous it might be. He did not think that was according to public policy. He moved the Amendment standing on the Paper.

Another Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 30, to leave out paragraph (b), of Sub-section (1), of Clause 8."—(*Mr. Perks.*)

Question proposed, "That paragraph (b) of Sub-section (1) of Clause 8 stand part of the Bill."

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said when the hon. Member found he could not reconcile the Amendment he originally moved

with his speech he moved another, but finally ended by moving the Amendment standing in the name of the hon. Member for North-west Durham, who was present, but did not himself move it. The 8th Clause, which the hon. Member proposed to deal with in this summary fashion, provided very wholesome restrictions on commencing business. A company was not to commence business, or exercise any borrowing powers, until the shares had been allotted to an amount not less in the whole than the minimum subscription, and until every director had paid to the company on each of the shares taken, or contracted to be taken by him, and for which he was liable to pay in cash, a proportion equal to the proportion payable on application and allotment on the shares offered for public subscription, and further until there had been filed with the registrar a statutory declaration by the secretary or one of the directors that the aforesaid conditions had been complied with. And then there was the provision that any contracts made by the company before the date at which it was entitled to commence business should be provisional only, and should not be binding on the company until that date. Surely these were most wholesome provisions, and their effect would not unduly restrict the operations of a company. He really totally failed to see how the hon. Gentleman could contend that the imposition of these wholesome restrictions would promote the formation of bogus companies, and he hoped the Amendment would not be adopted.

SIR ROBERT REID said that by Sub-section 3 contracts made by a company before the date at which it was entitled to commence business would be provisional only, but on that date they were to become binding. Now, the Attorney General was perfectly aware that there were certain classes of contracts entered into antecedent to the formation of the company which were in a suspended state until the directors and shareholders had had full opportunity of considering whether they were right and proper for the company to enter into. Would the Attorney General take steps to insert words to prevent these contracts being made binding by statute on the date the company commenced business?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said the sub-section applied only to contracts made by the company, and not by other persons as trustees for the company previous to the formation of the company. Of course, if there was any other objection to the contracts the effect of the sub-section would not be to make them binding.

MR. PERKS said that after the satisfactory explanation of the Attorney General he would withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. H. S. FOSTER moved, "In Clause 8, page 5, line 17, to omit the words 'which has commenced business,' in order to insert 'registered.'" The effect of the Amendment would be to exclude the application of the provisions of the section to companies which had been registered before the passing of the Act. There were many companies which during the last few days had been formed with many millions of capital, and they might proceed to allotment without having stated in their prospectus the minimum amount of subscription.

MR. RITCHIE said he was inclined to accept the Amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

*MR. MARKS moved to omit Sub-section 7 of Clause 8. The clause itself, he said, contained some very wholesome provisions with reference to the conditions under which a company was to be allowed to commence business. No company was to commence business until it had obtained a certificate from the registrar, and until that event no contract was binding on the company. But by Sub-section 7 this clause was not to apply to a company where there was no intention to ask the public to subscribe for its shares. But if, after registration, and at a later stage, that company issued an invitation to the public to subscribe for its shares, would the section then become operative for the first time; and if so, would the contracts which had been already made absolute cease to be absolute? And must the company cease to carry on business until

it had obtained another certificate from the registrar under the provisions of this clause? According to the clause no company could commence business unless it issued a prospectus on the same day that it applied for registration.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 19, to leave out Sub-section 7."—(*Mr. Marks.*)

Question proposed, "That Sub-section (7) stand part of the Bill."

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said that he could not agree with his hon. friend, although he admitted there might be some ambiguity in the sub-section. He did not think that the words, "Where there is no invitation to the public to subscribe for its shares," could be taken in the sense which the hon. Member sought to impute to them. In the case of a private company the clause would not apply; but where shares were put upon the market the restrictions of the clause ought to apply.

MR. FAITHFULL BEGG (Glasgow, St. Rollox) asked whether there was any definition of the phrase, "invitation to the public to subscribe." Unless there was such definition they would never know whether a company had applied to the public for subscriptions. Advertisement was a well-known means of invitation, but would the printing of a prospectus and sending it out marked "private and confidential"—which was quite a common case—be an invitation to the public to subscribe? That would be practically an appeal to the public, although technically it might not.

MR. RITCHIE said that the question had already been answered. Of course the clause did not give an absolute and final definition of what was "an invitation to the public to subscribe." He should say that it meant generally when the public were asked to subscribe for shares. He agreed with the Attorney General that his hon. friend's fears were groundless, but suggested that the following words might meet the objection raised:—"This section shall not apply to any company where the shares of the company are not already offered to the public for subscription."

MR. BILLSON (Halifax) said that the shares might be held by the promoters for a month or two and then offered to the public. He did not think the Attorney General had disposed of the difficulty which the hon. Member had raised.

MR. BRYCE hoped the House would see how serious the difficulty was. The Attorney General was obliged to admit that the construction put upon the clause by the hon. Member for St. George's was a possible construction. The suggested Amendment of the President of the Board of Trade did not carry them much further. Moreover it was an admission that there was considerable uncertainty about the clause. They did not want to give more work to the lawyers. As it was the Bill would give plenty. Therefore he hoped that, in one way or another, the Government would see their way to have the clause redrafted.

MR. RITCHIE said that after the criticisms that had been made he would undertake to confer upon the matter with the Lord Chancellor.

*MR. MARKS said that after the undertaking of his right hon. friend he was willing to withdraw his Amendment.

MR. H. S. FOSTER said there was a certain class of companies which would not have to go to the registrar for a certificate to commence business, so long as they could say of themselves that they were a private company. But that private company might find it necessary to make an appeal to the public afterwards, and would the provisions of the clause come into operation then, or would they have a retrospective effect? He trusted his right hon. friend would direct attention to the point so that it could be considered in another place.

SIR JAMES JOICEY quite recognised the importance of having this matter thoroughly reconsidered, as, unless there was some provision of the kind now proposed, the whole clause would be useless. The more he saw of these clauses the more satisfied was he that the Bill was not understood by even its framers.

MR. PERKS asked whether all the existing rights of registration were reserved in the case of private companies.

MR. RITCHIE: That is the intention.

MR. PERKS instanced the case of a company which, registered for private and family purposes with a large amount of capital, was about to make a public issue. When such a company had adopted, or would in future adopt as a private company, the existing proceedure, and then later on made a public issue, would it have to go to the Joint Stock Registry for a certificate to enable it to commence business, and comply with the different conditions laid down in this clause?

SIR EDWARD CARSON pointed out that in such a case the company would have already commenced business. The clause would apply only to new companies. A great deal of the difficulty which had been raised by hon. Members would have been disposed of if they had read the section already passed, providing that allotments should not be made until the minimum subscription of capital was forthcoming. The whole question hinged upon that, and the two clauses must be read together.

*MR. TOMLINSON said that the difficulty was occasioned by trying to make one set of words fit two quite distinct states of circumstances. The cases of issues before and after the company had commenced business had better have been dealt with separately.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. H. S. FOSTER moved to insert in Clause 9, line 22, after the word "shares," the words "as the result of a public issue." This clause required a return within a limited period after allotment. Manifestly the allotment was the general allotment of shares; but it frequently happened that a small number were allotted at various times, and there clearly could be no object in enacting that in such cases the return should be made under pain of heavy penalties.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 22, after the word 'shares,' to insert the words 'as the result of a public issue.'"—(*Mr. Harry Foster.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*MR. SYDNEY GEDGE pointed out that the issue of shares took place after the allotment, and therefore an allotment, while it might be the result of an invitation to the public, could not possibly be the result of an issue.

*MR. MARKS: I hope the Amendment will not be adopted, as it will take all the value from the provision. It is of the utmost importance that records of allotments, and the other matters set forth in this section, should be open to public inspection, and should be filed more particularly in the case of those companies which do not make public issues. The House will remember that there are other ways of selling shares than by means of public issues, and it is particularly desirable that an eye should be kept on the companies which do not make public issues, but do make allotments.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. RITCHIE stated that the series of Amendments standing next in his name were with reference to a clause interpolated in Committee at the instance of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen. The Government had consented to the repeal of Section 25 of the Companies Act, which imposed a very onerous fine upon any person holding shares other than shares paid for in cash, and which had not been registered. The result of non-registration in the case of an innocent holder might years afterwards be very serious, and the Government accepted the Amendment with the general consent of the Committee, but these slight Amendments were necessary.

MR. BRYCE agreed with the statements of the right hon. Gentleman as to the proceedings in the Standing Committee. The Amendment to repeal Section

25 of the Companies Act was accepted by the Government, but the Chancellor of the Exchequer made the condition that certain words should be introduced to safeguard the Treasury and provide against the diminution of revenue which might arise. That was understood by the Committee, and therefore there was no objection to these Amendments.

Amendments agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 31, to leave out the word 'number,' and insert the word 'numbers.'"—(*Mr. Sydney Gedge.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'number' stand part of the Bill."

MR. FAITHFULL BEGG said there was more in this Amendment than appeared on the surface. The alteration might be a very serious matter. The "number" of shares would be taken to mean the gross quantity, but to call upon a company to decide what particular numbers should be attached to particular shares was imposing a very serious obligation; and he failed to see what good could possibly be obtained thereby.

MR. RITCHIE remarked that the Amendments he was moving were Treasury Amendments, which he had consented to ask the House to insert, and it would be rather dangerous to depart from the arrangement he had made. He therefore could not accept the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Other Amendments made.

MR. ATHERLEY-JONES moved the omission of Clause 10. It was difficult to understand why the clause, if it was useful with regard to companies which invited public subscriptions, should not be equally applicable to companies of a private character. He objected to the clause on two grounds. The clause aimed at the prevention of payments of commissions or bonuses to persons for underwriting. The clause enabled that to be done providing there were disclosed on the prospectus the amount and other particulars; but it was totally illegal to do it otherwise. Such a provision would be altogether fatuous in its operation, and would simply multiply the opportunities for fraud. One of the results contemplated was that the purchase-money would be enhanced, that the promoter would receive something more than the real purchase money, and that that "something more" should be given by the promoter to the underwriter. How in the name of common sense did the right hon. Gentleman suppose he was going to follow a transaction of that kind? Unless a punitive law could be made effective it was far better not to attempt to apply such a law. Another objection was that by the clause a considerable amount of mischief would be done to legitimate company enterprise. Underwriting was an exceedingly common form of putting a company on the market, and it was not only a perfectly legitimate process, but a perfectly proper one. When the public knew that astute business men were willing to underwrite shares, it was a certain assurance that the enterprise was of considerable value. This clause would not only stop the fraudulent and improper company-mongers, but it would materially injure perfectly legitimate ventures. The amount paid for underwriting was regulated not by the fraudulent character of the company, but by the character of the enterprise and the risk inherent thereto. He trusted the public would not be given the idea that by a prospectus having to pass through these various methods of Government discipline they were thereby relieved of the necessity of inquiring into the nature of concerns to which they were invited to subscribe. This was a piece of vicious legislation, and it was being forced upon the House at a most improper rate of speed. He ventured respectfully to press upon the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade that he should seriously consider the desirability of pressing this clause, which, in the view of a very large number of people interested in public companies, was contrary to the interests not merely of companies, but of the public generally.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 38, to leave out Clause 10."—(*Mr. Atherley-Jones.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'Upon any offer of shares' stand part of the Bill."

MR. PHILLIPS (Pembroke) said that if this clause applied to companies already in existence, as he believed it did, it would have the effect practically of enabling companies to issue shares at a discount. Except in the case of railway companies and companies incorporated under special Acts, shares could not be issued at a discount. He instanced the case of a company with £10 shares quoted at £9. Until those shares came up to or above par, it was absolutely impossible for that company to issue more shares. If the clause under discussion became law it would be perfectly easy for a company with £10 shares quoted at £2, providing there was a clause in the Articles authorising it to be done, to issue shares at par and pay £9 per share for having it done. With the shares quoted at £2 it would be perfectly easy to get people to underwrite the shares on such conditions, as they would really be buying £2 shares for £1. The shares could be taken up in big lots, and afterwards sold little by little to the public. The real effect would thus be to issue shares at a discount. He did not say whether or not this was an advantage, but it absolutely changed the whole of the present company law, and the House should not take such a serious step without further consideration.

MR. RITCHIE did not think any clause in the Bill had attracted more public attention than the clause under consideration, nor was there any part of the proceedings connected with company promoting in regard to which more fraudulent practices had been carried out than that of underwriting shares. Although the law at present did not permit any commission to be paid for underwriting, it was notorious that underwriting did take place. Instead, however, of being paid for by the company it was paid for by the promoter, who took care to get his money out of the company. In many cases it was alleged that almost fraudulent companies were started by means of large amounts being paid for underwriting, and subsequently, by means of circulars and otherwise, shares which had been taken at 50 per cent. discount were foisted upon the unwary public at practically their full price. The Committee of the Board of Trade in connection with this Bill carefully considered whether or not the practice of underwriting—which might be perfectly legitimate — should be recognised on proper lines, and it was thought that the best means of dealing with the subject was by legalising that which at present was illegal, with the proviso that everything done in this respect should be fully disclosed. Hon. Gentlemen could not have it both ways. He quite admitted that an underwriting commission of 5 per cent. in some companies might be just as necessary as a commission of 1 per cent. in others. It was quite apparent that no men in their senses would take a large block of shares in a new company at a discount of 5 per cent. if they did not believe it was a good company and likely to do well. So far as he was concerned, he did not think there was the least fear of any company being injured by having to disclose the fact that a certain proportion of the capital had been underwritten; whereas if a company came forward which had been reduced to such straits as to offer to a syndicate or body of persons a discount of 50 per cent. in order to take a certain number of shares, then he thought that the public generally would draw from that the conclusion that the shares of that company were not genuine. Whether it was looked at from the one side or the other, he thought it would be wise for the House to accept this proposal. The transaction provided was a perfectly legitimate one. The disclosure to be made would have no ill effect upon a good company, but it would have an ill effect upon a bad company, and it was bad companies that they desired to strike at.

SIR ROBERT REID said that the great mischief arose because promoters made underwriting contracts of a most scandalous character. If they were prepared to regulate the action of promoters in regard to underwriting contracts he should be very glad to see it done. But what they did in this clause dealt with the company itself, and he wished to point out this fact to the right hon. Gentleman: whereas hitherto the practice of paying money for underwriting had been unlawful for a company, this clause now authorised a

company to do that very dangerous thing which up to now they were not allowed to do at all by the law. That was authorised by the sub-section of Section 10. The right hon. Gentleman said they might nullify the effect of that by providing for adequate disclosure, but he did not think the right hon. Gentleman had effected that in his clause, because the proposal was that money might be paid for this wretched business of underwriting. The words were—

"If the payment of the commission and the amount or rate per cent. of the commission paid or agreed to be paid are respectively authorised by the Articles of Association and disclosed in the prospectus, and the commission paid or agreed to be paid does not exceed the amount or rate so authorised."

Those hon. Members who were familiar with these matters knew that, in the first instance, there need not be a prospectus, and nothing would then be disclosed. The point he wished to make was that it was much better to have this thing, which was a dangerous thing, unlawful as it was now, because they were doing no good by licensing it and then limiting the licence. It had been said that underwriting was a very good thing, and in some few cases it might be. But everybody knew what actually took place, and he would appeal to their experience upon the subject. The promoter himself was the dangerous person, for he often took all the shares himself for the concern, and afterwards handed them over to the company. He generally made a bargain with the stockbroker, or somebody on the Stock Exchange, by which he placed a very large number of those shares on the market at a particular commission, and the stockbroker used all those methods of working the market, and all the rest of it, which caused the scandals with regard to these transactions. But whether underwriting was right or wrong, the point he wished to make was that it was better to have underwriting unlawful, as at present, rather than to legalise it.

*MR. SYDNEY GEDGE: This clause to which objection has been taken is an exceedingly important one, and I only regret that the audience which heard the hon. and learned Member for Dumfries is not now present.

Attention called to the fact that forty Members were not present (Dr. TANNER, Cork Co., Mid.). House counted, and forty Members being found present,

*MR. SYDNEY GEDGE: The hon. and learned Member for Dumfries objected to this clause, because he thought it was better to leave certain existing customs alone than in any way to legalise them. I take a different view. The law as it stands undoubtedly prevents a company issuing any of its shares at a discount, but the obvious necessities of the case have rendered it necessary to evade that law in a very curious way. The advantages of so doing are so great that a very large number of people who ordinarily would not think of disobeying the law or doing anything wrong consider themselves perfectly justified in committing what may be called an evasion of the law. They proceed as follows: It is absolutely necessary to raise the capital required by a new company. This, as has been found by experience, cannot be done in most cases except by finding people to underwrite, as it is called, the minimum capital required to enable the company to commence business. The company cannot do that directly, and therefore the money required to secure the underwriting is added to the price paid to the vendor. He knows what it is, and the directors know what it is, but the existing shareholders and the subscribing public do not. It may be a large sum or a moderate sum, but the public have no knowledge of it. We have, therefore, an evasion of the law, we have secrecy, we have an unknown amount, and we have an abuse which this clause will remedy. The Government have, to my mind, looked this matter fairly in the face. They have recognised facts as they have found them, and have dealt with them accordingly. The mischief is that companies are not permitted to pay directly for underwriting, or, in other words, to issue shares at a discount, and, therefore, have to have recourse to a roundabout way of securing what they require. The Bill as it is framed does away with the indirectness and secrecy, and provides that except in the manner provided—

"No company shall apply any of its shares or capital money, either directly or indirectly, in payment of any commission, discount, or allowance to any person in consideration of his subscribing or agreeing to subscribe, whether absolutely or conditionally, for any shares of

the company, or procuring or agreeing to procure subscriptions, whether absolute or conditional, for any shares in the company, whether the shares or money be so applied by being added to the purchase money of any property acquired by the company or to the contract price of any work to be executed for the company, or the money be paid out of the nominal purchase money or contract price or otherwise."

The Bill removes the illegality of issuing shares at a discount, and renders underwriting lawful under conditions which secure publicity, because the rate per cent. of the commission must be mentioned and the underwriting must be authorised by the Articles of Association, and must be set out in the prospectus. Therefore the investing public will have before them what has taken place. Surely the House will see that that is an infinitely better state of things than the existing law. I do not maintain that it will stop abuses, but it will make them much more difficult, because everyone who subscribes to a company will know what is being done and will know the difference between fair and unfair profit. The underwriter subscribes for a large number of shares, and runs the risk of their being left on his hands, and it is quite fair that he should be paid for that risk. Next I come to the companies already in existence who wish to issue more capital. The first thing is that the Articles of Association will have to be altered, because under existing Articles of Association it would be illegal to issue shares at a discount. The Articles can only be altered by two special meetings of the company, and the alteration must be carried by a majority of three-fourths, and full notice must be given to all concerned; and if there is to be a prospectus issued, the prospectus must give full particulars. I therefore cannot think how, under such circumstances, the hon. and learned Member for Dumfries can prefer the present state of legal evasion to this rational proposal, which secures full publicity.

MR. FAITHFULL BEGG: I hope the Government will adhere to this clause. The only thing which the clause requires is, possibly, that it should be extended so as to include all kinds of companies, and not be limited as it is at present, but that is a matter which will come up for discussion in connection with a later Amendment. I hope the Government will adhere to the clause, so that the whole of the transactions which have taken place in connection with a company should be shown. This is a matter which has practically emerged from the Committee with all parties in agreement regarding it. It has become manifest to everyone that some means must be found to enable the underwriting of the capital of a company to be legitimately undertaken in an above-board and straightforward manner. I do not say that under this clause, or under any clause which can be drawn, you will get a state of things that will be ideal, or to which objection cannot be taken; but that under this clause you will get a state of things infinitely better than the existing state of things is beyond question. The hon. and learned Member for Dumfries who spoke against this clause seemed to me to rest his case on exceedingly flimsy grounds. He practically gave his case away when he spoke of "this wretched underwriting business." Why should the principle of underwriting be recognised in connection with all other matters of business in which risk is involved, and not in connection with companies? Why it should be spoken of as a wretched business seems to be inexplicable. To underwrite a vessel at sea, or the immunity of a house from fire or any other risk, is a legitimate piece of business, but it is considered improper and illegal to underwrite the capital of a company offering its shares for public subscription. It might be vital to that company that a certain amount of capital should be secured in advance, and there is no other plan of doing that except by getting certain persons to take this underwriting risk. The law hitherto in this country—though it is not the case in other countries — has nominally prohibited the underwriting of capital; but practically, as my hon. friend has explained, the law has been evaded. Nowadays no prospectus is ever issued to the public without a statement that some contracts have been entered into which may come under the regulations of the Companies Acts as they exist, and acceptance of which is taken as waiving the right to challenge these contracts. What has been the result? The prices have been unduly inflated, and exactly that which the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite said might take place, has been done, but in an infinitely more vicious

form than will be possible if this clause becomes law, and transaction of the kind has to be disclosed. I quite agree with my hon. and learned friend opposite, who said that we ought to have further consideration of certain clauses of the Bill, but I think he was entirely wrong in saying that we have not had full opportunity of considering this particular clause. This matter has been before the country in one form and another for four or five years. There is nothing in the direction of the Amendment of the Companies Acts which has been more thoroughly threshed out, and I hope that the Government will adhere to the clause, and thus enable us to get rid of this constant scandal. Under the protection of the clause the public will be able to know exactly what it is they are subscribing for, in the sense that there is no loading or watering of the stock of which they are not aware.

MR. LABOUCHERE said they had been told that at present underwriting was illegal; but whether illegal or not they knew that it took place in numbers of companies, and practically the company paid for the underwriting. The clause recognised underwriting as an existing fact, and declared that it should be permitted provided it was disclosed in the prospectus. One could form a pretty accurate estimate of the character of a company when the amount paid for underwriting was known. If 1, 2, or 3 per cent. was paid, then that company must be worth something; but suppose it ran up to 90 per cent., then they knew that that was a perfectly speculative and gambling transaction. The amount paid for underwriting was, in fact, a natural barometer, showing what a company was in the estimate of business men. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would stand to the clause; in truth, the Bill without it would be a perfect farce. He would ask whether a promoter would have a right to underwrite a company?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: The promoter may do that at his own expense, but he cannot get the cost of the underwriting out of the company.

MR. LABOUCHERE said there was another point on which he desired some light. Sub-section 3 said that "nothing in this section should affect the power of any company to pay such brokerage as it has heretofore been lawful for a company to pay." What did that mean? It meant that they might pay any broker—not necessarily a man on the Stock Exchange—any amount of money to place shares.

MR. FAITHFULL BEGG: There is a limit.

MR. LABOUCHERE: The hon. Gentleman said there was a limit; but the limit had not been fixed. The words were, "Such brokerage as has heretofore been lawful." Brokerage was paid to brokers, and it might be there had hitherto been some limitations. What was underwriting? It was a species of brokerage, but the underwriter guaranteed that a certain number of shares would be taken, and therefore he was the better man than the broker. The underwriter said, "I will guarantee to take so many shares if you pay me 5 per cent." The broker said, "If you pay me 5s. per share I will try and place the shares among my clients." It seemed to him that, if they insisted on the amount paid for underwriting being disclosed, the payments for brokerage should be disclosed also.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said he found himself in entire accordance with the hon. Gentleman who had just spoken as to what he stated in regard to the existence of underwriting and the desirability of recognising the fact which could not be prevented—precautions being taken at the same time to prevent an abuse of the practice. These precautions were to secure that the public would know what allowance was being made to the underwriter. As long as that was known he could not help thinking that the more judicious course was that indicated in the clause. His hon. and learned friend seemed to think that they ought not to recognise anything so unholy as underwriting.

SIR ROBERT REID: By a company.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: By a company. But did his hon. and learned friend suppose that it would not go on very much as before? The promoter

paid the underwriter a commission, and then he added that to the purchase money which he got out of the public. Surely the more sensible course was to recognise the facts, and to take such precautions as would prevent mischief being done to the public.

MR. LABOUCHERE asked if the Attorney General would be kind enough to say whether the promoter must add the commission paid for underwriting, and the commission paid to the broker.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said that what was proposed to be done was to secure entire publicity, and except under that publicity the company should not directly or indirectly be concerned in payment for underwriting. What the sub-section said was—

"Save as aforesaid no company shall apply any of its shares or capital money either directly or indirectly in payment of any commission, discount, or allowance to any person in consideration of his subscribing or agreeing to subscribe, whether absolutely or conditionally, for any shares of the company, or procuring or agreeing to procure subscriptions, whether absolute or conditional, for any shares in the company, whether the shares or money be so applied by being added to the purchase money of any property acquired by the company or to the contract price of any work to be executed for the company, or the money paid out of the nominal purchase money or contract price, or otherwise."

Now, surely if it was possible to forbid a company doing indirectly what they desired to prevent, the words of the clause would have that effect. If the promoter chose to pay commission for underwriting, in future he would have to do it out of his own pocket, because there was an express prohibition to prevent him doing it otherwise.

MR. LABOUCHERE said that the promoter received the money; he did not have to say, "I am going to use it in underwriting," but he said, "It is worth my while to pay 5 or 10 per cent. to have these shares taken up."

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said that if the price was a fair price the promoter might pay it out of his own pocket; but if it was not a fair price it was expressly forbidden to be done. Of course there might be evasions in every case. No Act was so broad that it would be impossible that it should be evaded. The hon. Gentleman referred to the subject of brokerage. Brokerage was perfectly distinct from underwriting. An underwriter had to guarantee that the shares would be taken up by the public or that he would take them up himself. In the case of brokerage the broker guaranteed nothing of the kind, and it had been held that it was the law that a company might pay brokerage for having shares placed.

MR. LABOUCHERE: To any amount?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: No; a proper amount.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is a proper amount?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: No actual limit has been fixed, but the amount of brokerage as distinguished from commission for underwriting is very small indeed—an eighth or a quarter per cent. If a broker was found charging beyond those figures it was not really brokerage but commission for underwriting with a guarantee that the shares would be taken up by himself or his friends. What had been done by this clause was to recognise what was at present the law as regarded brokerage. Every lawyer knew that payment of brokerage was at present not illegal—say an eighth or a quarter—for placing shares of a company. According to the section, it was proposed to enact that a company might pay a certain commission for underwriting so long as everything was above board and the public were fully aware of what was being done. Under the circumstances, he hoped the House would not refuse to agree to a clause which promised to have a very beneficial effect.

MR. BRYCE said, as he understood from what they heard in Grand Committee, that brokerage was to some extent elastic, but it was a pretty well established rule that it should not go above a half or three-quarters per cent. If that was agreed to, the result of the clause which the Government proposed to pass was that when any brokerage had been paid by the company it would be for those who endeavoured to justify brokerage to

show that it was really brokerage, leaving it to the court to decide whether it was a secret or unlawful form of underwriting and the payment of a secret commission. He could not feel quite satisfied with the answer of the Attorney General to the criticisms of his hon. and learned friend with regard to the position of the promoter. If the promoter knew, to begin with, that it was he rather than the company who had an interest in planting the shares, and ought to undertake the underwriting, he would estimate how much he had to pay for underwriting before selling to the company, and add that to the amount for which he was going to sell. The Attorney General said that that must be a fair price, but who was to say what was a fair price? How was it possible, where the vendor was the promoter, and was selling the business to a company, to estimate within any fair distance of the truth what was a reasonable price to pay? They all knew how excessively vague was the estimate that was put on the worth of a company's business—not only of the tangible assets but of the goodwill. Therefore he said that it would not be possible under this clause to catch the promoter, and he feared they must at present acquiesce in the probability that promoters would continue to pay secret commissions as they had hitherto done. But was it not better if they could compel the company to a full disclosure that they should do so, even if they could not get at the promoter? This matter had been very fully debated by an exceedingly strong Departmental Committee, which included four of Her Majesty's judges, upon whose labours this Bill was founded; and the Committee said that it would be far safer to practically prohibit these underwriting commissions unless they were disclosed, rather than have the secret practice continued.

*MR. MARKS ventured to say that the most pregnant observation made in the course of the debate on this section was that made by the President of the Board of Trade. He pointed out the great advantage it would be to a company which decided to pay a certain amount for underwriting their shares if the rate of underwriting commission were set forth in the prospectus and in the memorandum and articles of association. He was inclined to the view of the right hon. Gentleman that if the underwriting commission was of a reasonable and moderate amount, it would induce the public to come in and take shares. It was within the knowledge of anyone who took an interest in the matter that these underwriting commissions had not hitherto been paid by the company, but by the promoter; and it was absolutely impossible to prevent the promoter from taking the amount of his underwriting risk into consideration when he fixed the price of the property of which he was the vendor. The price was always inclusive of the underwriting commission. But the company might come in and say to the promoter, "According to what you and your friends have told us you are willing to underwrite these shares at a penny," and he would reply, "Oh, yes; my friends say that they are so confident in the success of the company that they will underwrite it at a penny." Thereupon the company would pay the penny, and a prospectus would then be issued, in which it would be set forth that the directors were so happy to state that they had succeeded in underwriting the shares at a penny. Was that a protection to the public? Was it not to open the door to another trap to the public? Again, it was said that the company would have to disclose all the facts; but they could not fix on the company that they knew all that had been done by the underwriter behind their back. There is this one thing to beware of. By this power to underwrite or pay commission for underwriting to an indefinite and unlimited extent you will introduce into your limited company business an evil which has been the greatest evil in this business in the United States of America, the issue of shares at a discount "treasury stock," as it is called, which is one of the greatest evils in the States. A company is required to state in its Memorandum and Articles of Association not the amount going to be paid, but what the company takes power to pay in respect to underwriting. The company issues its prospectus and states that it takes power to issue shares at a discount at 19s. in the £, and they may so issue. Who is to know six months after the statutory meeting has been called, which is the only protection given by this Bill

to the general public, that the £1 shares then upon the market were issued at 19s. ? They may be valuable assets in the case of bankruptcy, but they are not valuable assets to the investing public. There ought to be a legitimate power to underwrite, but there should be some limit beyond which the company should not go. The great evil of this clause seems to be that it gives a power to the company to put into its prospectus statements with respect to underwriting which might be a direct incentive to the public to come in and take shares. The promoters will not find fault with this clause, it does not touch them ; nothing in this Bill does touch them in their powers as to underwriting, and in my opinion nothing in any Bill could. That is a fact that it is as well should be known, and it cannot be known too soon.

MR. BANBURY (Camberwell, Peckham) thought there might be something to be said for disclosing in the prospectus every commission paid, but the first to be disclosed should be the commission paid to brokers ; that was far more important than the commission paid to underwriters. The commission paid to brokers, as a rule, would be one-eighth or quarter per cent., but how was anybody to find out until too late what commission had been paid? The great thing to consider was how the public were most likely to be safeguarded, and he thought that they would best be safeguarded if there was declared in the prospectus the commissions that had been paid to everybody, brokers, solicitors, stockbrokers, etc. Without such a provision, all the solicitor had to do was to put a stamp upon the paper and to send the prospectus to people whom he thought were likely to invest, and nobody would be the wiser and able to find out until too late what had been done. As to underwriting, after a sound company came into existence it might be found necessary to issue debentures or preference shares in order to obtain capital to carry on a legitimate enterprise, and it was necessary to get that money by a certain date. Then, with the sanction of the shareholders, the company went to an underwriter and paid 2½ per cent. to him, and he subscribed in the hope that in a few months he would be able to recoup himself. That was a legitimate transaction, and such a transaction did no harm to the company. If this clause was to be passed he thought every commission that was paid ought to be disclosed.

*MR. LAWSON WALTON agreed with the hon. Member for St. George's that the abuse of underwriting was entirely unaffected by the clause of the Bill as it stood. But he thought that the clause was a step in the right direction, because it made underwriting, instead of being a secret process, a legitimate operation performed in the open light of day. Was it not better to legitimatise such an operation, and to provide that the companies should give full notice of the terms which were paid for the services rendered to it? The tendency of such legislation would be to put an end to furtive and secret operations, and make them legitimate, and it would also bring the law into harmony with the practice and the views of commercial men upon the question.

MR. BOUSFIELD (Hackney) hoped that the House would not go to a division on the motion to omit the clause. Although the discussion had been most valuable, he did not see that the result desired would be attained by rejecting the clause, and he hoped some way would be found of utilising two or three of the points which had been raised. Everyone was anxious to put down secret underwriting, and he thought that the form of underwriting by the company itself, as was suggested by the clause, was the right way of proceeding. The whole matter was a question of evolution, and that process had gone so far now that company directors themselves were putting into the prospectus statements that no underwriting had been undertaken. But these matters were put in the prospectus merely to catch the unwary, and people were now beginning to look for some legislation of this kind. It was possible that a double set of commissions might be paid, and that that state of things might coincide with the secret and unannounced fact that promoters themselves had been paid a large amount by way of commission for underwriting

Therefore it seemed to him that in order to carry out the policy of the clause as drafted, and to prevent its being used in an illegitimate way, the clause ought to go further as regards disclosure of underwriting contracts, by providing that these should be stated, at all events so far as known to the directors and vendors. This would tend to put underwriting in the hands of the company, where it might very well be. As regards brokerage, too, he suggested that it was desirable to put something more definite into the clause instead of merely a permission to pay such brokerage "as had hitherto been lawful."

MR. RITCHIE said that considerable time had now been spent in discussing the clause, and a good deal of business yet remained to be done, and he therefore hoped that the House would now consider that discussion was practically exhausted, and that they would come to a decision upon it.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.) said that the appeal of the right hon. Gentleman was, he thought, far from being reasonable. The Bill had been rushed through the Committee, whose Report was not yet in the hands of Members, and this discussion was very valuable.

MR. RITCHIE said he could not agree with the hon. Member, seeing that the Committee sat day after day, and of the discussions which had taken place the House had been kept fully informed.

MR. LOUGH quite agreed that the proceedings of the Committee had been distributed day by day, but was of opinion that a great deal of trouble was necessary to discover what had actually taken place in Committee. He submitted that the House ought to be treated with greater respect, and not be hurried along in a matter of this importance before a proper Report of the Committee had been issued. The arguments urged to recommend this clause were that the clause would have a tendency to restrict the evil practice of underwriting if it were passed, but the object of the clause was to enable companies to pay underwriting commissions out of their capital, and thus legalise underwriting. That was a fundamental change in regard to companies, which ought not to be made in too great a hurry. The Government practically said, "Although we legalise the practice, we will prevent any harm arising by taking precautions"; but then the question arose as to whether those precautions would be sufficient; he did not think they would. After this Bill was passed the company would be empowered to pay large commissions for underwriting out of their capital, and it would be absolutely impossible to find out what capital they had left. He thought that the clause was an attempt to make people honest by Act of Parliament, and he did not think it would succeed.

MR. H. S. FOSTER supported the view that this difficult and complex question was being discussed under most unfortunate circumstances through hon. Members not having the Report of the Committee before them. This question had engaged the attention of a Committee of the House of Lords for five years, and was practically pitchforked into the House of Commons, which was asked to discuss and settle a most difficult problem under exceedingly difficult circumstances. This clause, if passed, would create much greater evils than it sought to remedy. It would give a company power to underwrite or issue their own shares at a discount, a power which at present was very wisely withheld from them. A great deal had been said of the illegality of underwriting, but it was perfectly legal; the only illegality there could be would be in the company being allowed to underwrite. A company was a nonentity until it had gone to allotment, and the underwriting was antecedent to that stage. It was a scheme to call a company into existence and provide the necessary funds, and a certain amount was paid to recoup the underwriter for the necessary risk. Therefore, the company itself could never be asked to underwrite its own shares, for the reason that a company was unable to enter into a contract until after it started business. The remedy which he would suggest was that the President of the Board of Trade should provide in the clause that the underwriting contract entered into between the promoters and the underwriters should be disclosed in the pro-

spectus, and that unless that was so disclosed the contract should be void.

MR. LAWSON WALTON: There is an Amendment further down on the Paper to effect that very object.

MR. H. S. FOSTER said that in that way publicity would be ensured in the most effective way.

MR. PERKS said that underwriting was simply gambling and betting in public companies, involving large sums of public money, and he thought it was better to leave promoters to run the risks they run at present than to give Parliamentary sanction to a practice which in itself was so reprehensible.

MR. BUTCHER (York) said that underwriting was a perfectly fair transaction in itself. An abuse of the process took place when underwriting was done at an exorbitant commission and that fact was concealed from the investing public. Under proper conditions of disclosure it appeared to him that there could be no objection to underwriting. It had been objected to the clause that there might be two underwriting commissions, one paid by the company, which according to that clause would be disclosed, and one paid by the promoter or vendor, which would not, it was alleged, be disclosed, and that thereby the public would be deceived; but he did not think that would be so, because Sub-section (*h*) of Clause 12 was drawn up in terms which amounted to a provision that the prospectus issued by a company should set forth on the face of it the amount of underwriting commission, no matter by whom it was paid. It might be that that was not sufficiently clear on the face of it, but he thought the sub-section would provide for cases of this kind, and he supported the clause.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 160; Noes, 32. (Division List No. 235.)

AYES.

Allison, Robert Andrew
Allsopp, Hon. George
Arnold-Foster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Baillie, J. E. B. (Inverness)
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (Leeds)
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol
Begg, Ferdinand Faithfull
Bemrose, Sir Henry Howe
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bigwood, James
Bousfield, William Robert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Butcher, John George
Caldwell, James
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r
Charrington, Spencer
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Cook, Fred. Lucas (Lambeth)
Cooke, C. W. Radcliffe (Heref'd)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton
Curzon, Viscount
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William T.
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir W. Hart
Faber, George Denison
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fenwick, Charles
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir R. Penrose.
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flower, Ernest
Foster, Sir W. (Derby Co.)
Garfit, William
Gedge, Sydney
Gibbons, J. Lloyd
Gibbs, Hn A. G. H. (City of Lond.
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir J. Eldon
Goschen, Rt Hn G J (St. George's
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Green, W. D. (Wednesbury)
Gull, Sir Cameron
Hamilton, Rt. Hn. Lord Geo.
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robert W.
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hazell, Walter
Hedderwick, Thomas Chas. H.
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Robt. Trotter
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, E. Brodie (Hampstead
Hoare, Sir Samuel (Norwich)
Holland, William Henry
Houston, R. P.
Howard, Joseph
Kearley, Hudson E.
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Lawrence, Sir E. Durning-(Corn
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks.)
Lawson, Sir W. (Cumberland)
Lea, Sir Thomas (Londonderry
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewelyn, Sir Dillwyn- (Swans.
Long, Col. Charles W (Evesham
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowles, John
Macartney, W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Malcolm, Ian
Marks, Henry Hananel
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Mellor, Colonel (Lancashire)
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Middlemore, Jn. Throgmorton
Milward, Colonel Victor
Monckton, Edward Philip
Monk, Charles James
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James A. (Wilts., S)
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)
Muntz, Philip A.
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath
Myers, William Henry
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Oldroyd, Mark
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert P. (Darlington

Phillpotts, Captain Arthur
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plunkett, Rt. Hn. H. Curzon
Purvis, Robert
Rankin, Sir James
Remnant, James Farquharson
Richardson, Sir T. (Hartlep'l)
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridley, Rt. Hn. Sir Matthew W.
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney
Robson, William Snowdon
Russell, T. W. (Tyrone)
Samuel, J. (Stockton-on-Tees)
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. E. J.
Seely, Charles Hilton
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw, Chas. Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, J. Parker (Lanarks.)
Spencer, Ernest
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Wallace, Robert
Walton, J. Lawson (Leeds, S.)
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E. (Kent)
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Joseph Powell-(Birm
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Banbury, Frederick George
Bond, Edward
Cameron, Robert (Durham)
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Dunn, Sir William
Foster, Harry S. (Suffolk)
Gourley, Sir Edw. Temperley
Hayden, John Patrick
Healy, Maurice (Cork)
Healy, Timothy M. (N. Louth)
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.
Lough, Thomas
Macaleese, Daniel
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
M'Dermott, Patrick
M'Ghee, Richard
M'Leod, John
Molloy, Bernard Charles
Morgan, W Pritchard (Merthyr
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Perks, Robert William
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Provand, Andrew Dryburgh
Reid, Sir Robert Threshie
Steadman, William Charles
Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)
Tanner, Charles Kearns
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Atherley-Jones and Mr. Billson.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 38, to leave out the words 'for public,' and insert the words 'to the public for.'"—(*Mr. Ritchie.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'for public' stand part of the Bill."

MR. FAITHFULL BEGG said that the Amendment left matters as regarded private companies exactly where they were. Was it not possible to extend the provisions of the clause to all companies? If the clause was a good one there could be no reason why it should not equally apply to private companies equally as to public companies. To limit whatever privilege the clause conferred to one class of subscribers was a mistake. If the word 'public' were struck out altogether the permissive power would extend to both public and private subscribers.

*MR. SYDNEY GEDGE suggested that the words of the Amendment would exactly meet the object of the hon. Member.

MR. RITCHIE said it was manifest that where no appeal was made to the public the clause would be inappropriate; its object was the protection of the public. He could not accept the proposal of the hon. Gentleman.

MR. H. S. FOSTER argued that if it was right to clothe a public company with such power as the clause gave to pay a commission to subscribers, it could not be wrong to clothe a company which did not make an appeal to the public with similar power, should that company desire to pay commission to private subscribers.

SIR THOMAS LEA said he had an Amendment dealing with this particular point, and the very close division in the Grand Committee when this point was discussed at length justified raising it in the House. He thought that a private company should at least have the same privilege in this matter as was conceded to a public company.

*MR. SYDNEY GEDGE contended that it was perfectly reasonable that shareholders should be able to take up shares at a discount, and to raise further capital among themselves. If it was lawful for directors to give this boon to the public, why not to their own shareholders?

MR. LOUGH said that although this was described as a verbal Amendment, it was of a very substantial character. If the Amendment of the President of the Board of Trade was adopted, it would be impossible to make the important alteration suggested by the hon. Member for St. Rollox.

MR. RITCHIE pointed out that he was merely proposing to do in this clause the same as had been done in other clauses where the words "for public subscription" had been used. Instead of "for public subscription" the words "to the public for subscription," were to be inserted. It was purely verbal.

MR. LOUGH could not agree with the view of the right hon. Gentleman. If this alteration were agreed to it would be very difficult, if not impossible, to make the Amendment suggested by the hon. Member for St. Rollox. It was evident there was a considerable consensus of opinion in the House of Commons, and a very considerable minority of opinion in the Grand Committee, that whatever benefits this clause conferred on public companies should be conferred on private companies also. The matter certainly required further consideration. There was no definition in the Bill of a "public" company or of a "private" company; the one ran into the other, and practically it was very hard to draw a line between the two. This point ought to be cleared up before the Government asked the House to vote for the Amendment.

MR. BOUSFIELD said that while it was quite true that this matter was raised in the form of a purely drafting Amendment, it came just at a critical point when the House wanted to discuss whether the provisions of the clause should be limited to cases where shares were offered for public subscription, or whether they ought not also to apply to cases where the shares were offered privately for subscription. The best way of settling the matter would be merely to leave out the word "public." With regard to the substance of the question, it seemed to be supposed that there was some distinction in law or in the Bill between public and private companies, and that supposition very much confused the issue before the House. There was no such distinction. Every company was in the eye of the law a public company, even though it was what was commonly called a private company. The question at issue was not whether the clause ought to apply to private as well as public companies, but whether it was to apply to shares offered privately as well as to shares offered publicly for subscription. It was difficult to see why this disability should be maintained in the case of private issues if it was removed in the case of public issues, and it would seem far better, and would greatly simplify matters, if the disability were removed in both cases. Moreover, private issues and public issues so merged the one into the other that it was very difficult in practice to distinguish between the two. Take the case of a company with a large body of shareholders. If that company wanted to issue further shares, and sent out a memorandum to all its shareholders offering these shares for subscription, would the Attorney General consider that to be a public or a private issue? There was no real distinction to be drawn, and the best way would be for the Government to omit the word "public" altogether.

MAJOR JAMESON (Clare, W.) contended there never was an Amendment which opened the way to more litigation than this so-called purely verbal alteration. All the talent on the front bench was unable to define the difference between a public and a private company, and he agreed with the previous speaker that the word "public" had better be omitted.

Question put, and negatived.

Question proposed, "That the words 'to the public for' be there inserted."

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"To leave out the words 'to the public.'"—(*Mr. Sydney Gedge.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'to the public' stand part of the proposed Amendment."

MR. H. S. FOSTER hoped the Attorney General would respond to the appeal

which had been made, and define whether, in a given case, an issue was for public or private subscription. The point under discussion was decided by a very narrow majority in the Committee, and as a supposed concession to the minority this verbal alteration was being made. But it was really no concession whatever, and did not remove the objection of those who desired that the one class of companies should not labour under disabilities from which the other were free.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: The answer to the question which has been raised is very simple. The issue is not offered to the public if it is offered only to a particular class of persons. It does not matter whether the shareholders of the company are many or few; as long as the offer is only to that particular class it is not an offer to the public for subscription.

MR. BOUSFIELD said the reply of the Attorney General did not at all improve matters, and he appealed to the Government to reconsider the question and see whether they could not do away with the distinction altogether.

*MR. MARKS pointed out that the reply of the Attorney General simply emphasised the peculiar difficulty which this clause would cause. According to that reply an issue of shares to the 70,000 shareholders in Lipton's would not be a public issue, but an issue to a company with 1,000 shareholders, if only ten outsiders came in, would be a public issue. Absurdity could really go no farther.

MR. PHILIPPS asked the Attorney General to define a "class." If a company which was going to issue shipping shares sent prospectuses marked "private" to the shareholders in another shipping company, would that be an issue to a class? Or if it was proposed to turn a political club in any constituency into a company, and the shares were offered to the members of that club, would that be an issue to a class? Many such instances at once occurred to one's mind, and it was certain that such a provision would lead to endless litigation. The least the Government could do was to define what they meant by a private or public issue, as, if the Bill went out in its present form, countless lawsuits would be the result.

MR. TOMLINSON hoped the Government would see their way to allow this Amendment to be made. If a privilege was to be given to one sort of company, why should it be withheld from another class in regard to which it could do no harm, and might do much good?

MR. BRYCE: I am not quite sure that the effect of this Amendment is generally apprehended. I understand that if we agreed to the Amendment now being made it would be possible for a company not making a public issue to pay underwriting commission. That is the very thing we do not wish a company to have power to do. We say there are certain arguments which may justify the payment of underwriting commissions in cases where there is a public issue, and where all the facts are disclosed in the prospectus, but we think—and this was the view argued out in the Standing Committee—that those arguments do not apply to companies not going to the public for subscription, and that in such cases there ought not to be any provision whatever for underwriting. I therefore hope the Government will adhere to the Bill as it stands.

COLONEL MILWARD (Warwickshire, Stratford-upon-Avon) hoped the Amendment would be adopted. It was quite evident that private companies were placed under disadvantages in this clause. It was impossible in an Act of Parliament to draw any distinction between a public and a private company, and under the circumstances it would be advisable that the Amendment should be accepted.

MAJOR JAMESON supported the Amendment. He absolutely denied that it was ever the intention that private companies should come under the Bill, while the definition given by the Attorney General was the most absurd statement ever made. The Bill was of the utmost importance to the country, and he strongly protested against it being rushed through the House with such unwarrantable speed.

MR. FAITHFULL BEGG thought perhaps the right hon. Gentleman had overlooked the precise wording of the clause itself. The provision was not limited to the case of a man who took a large number of

shares and afterwards endeavoured to get other people to buy them, but it extended to the case of a man who agreed, whether absolutely or conditionally, to take shares in a company. The provision would permit a company to make a payment to a man who took shares for his own use and profit, and the House were discussing a privilege which went far beyond the question of underwriting.

MR. PERKS: I notice that the minority of fifteen who voted against the Government in the Standing Committee consisted entirely of gentlemen who usually vote with the Government. I think that is some reason why the Government should not consider unfavourably the proposal to extend the operation of this clause to all companies alike, whether they are called "private" or "public." I quite agree with the hon. and learned Member for North Hackney as to the great difficulty of drawing a line between the two classes of companies; in fact, I believe it is absolutely impossible. At least half a dozen appeals have been made to the Law Officers to define the difference, but we have had no information on the point at all. I wish to call attention to a statement on this particular point made by a counsel well known at the Equity Bar, and one who has probably more experience than any other in connection with joint stock company enterprises—I mean Mr. Palmer. In his letter to *The Times* a few days ago, dealing specifically with this question—and I think his opinion is worth considering—he says—

"As to Clause 10, this limits the power to pay commission for placing shares to cases in which an offer of shares for public subscription is made. It should be extended to all cases, for there is no reason why a private company should not be at liberty to pay a commission for placing shares, or why it should not be allowable to pay a commission where the shares, as in the case of a reconstruction, are offered not to the public, but only to the shareholders in the reconstructing company. Therefore, the clause should be amended by inserting after the word 'public' the words 'or private,' and by inserting the words 'if any' after the word 'prospectus.'"

That is the opinion not of a mere child, but of a man who has had probably more experience than any counsel at the Equity Bar on this matter, and I venture to commend it to the attention of Her Majesty's Government.

MR. BRODIE HOARE (Hampstead) said it really did not very much matter whether the word "public" was omitted or not, as anybody with the smallest ingenuity could get round the provision. All a private company would have to do would be to print enough circulars and prospectuses to go round to all its shareholders, and one hundred additional, which could be scattered broadcast about the streets or anywhere. The issue would then become a public issue, and be within the provisions of the clause. The whole thing was not worth fighting about, and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would accept the Amendment.

MR. LAWSON WALTON contended that no reason whatever had been shown why a private company should be allowed to pay underwriting commission on the placing of shares which were not issued to the public. In other words, it was argued that a private company should be allowed to pay underwriting commission for issuing shares to its own shareholders. He could understand a commission being paid for outside assistance in inducing members of the public to subscribe, as in that case the consideration for the payment was the service thus rendered. If a company was not going to make a public issue why should they be allowed to use these agents? The whole of the limitations were placed not upon shares held by the public, but upon those held by persons who were not members of the public. He thought it was clear that an issue to the public was an issue to any member of the public who came forward and took shares in the ordinary way. Why should they give power to a company to detract from the nominal value of the capital by the employment of brokers, who ought not to be required? He hoped the Government would not yield to the pressure which was being put upon them from all quarters of the House.

MR. BOND pointed out that the effect of the clause was simply to enable companies to issue shares at a discount. Why should a company be allowed to issue its shares at a discount?

MR. LOUGH said he only wished to answer one question. The hon. Member who had just sat down asked, why should a company be allowed to offer shares to

its own shareholders at a discount? At such times as those shares were offered there might be some very good reason. It might be difficult to get money, and it might be advisable to take advantage of some bargain that had been offered to the company. In such circumstances the company would be offering to all its shareholders some advantage. He wished to ask his hon. and learned friend why should it be an unlawful proceeding with these particular companies, while it might be quite lawful in the case of some other companies? He hoped the House would take a common-sense view of this question.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 136; Noes, 61. (Division List No. 236.)

AYES.

Allsopp, Hon. George
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Baillie, James E. B. (Inverness
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol
Bemrose, Sir Henry Howe
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bethell, Commander
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bryce, Rt. Hn. James
Butcher, John George
Caldwell, James
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)
Cecil, Evelyn (Hertford, East)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Bir.)
Chamberlain, J. A. (Worc'r)
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Charrington, Spencer
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Cook, Fred. Lucas (Lambeth)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Crombie, John William
Cross, H. Shepherd (Bolton)
Curzon, Viscount
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Dunn, Sir William
Dyke, Rt. Hon Sir William Hart
Faber, George Denison
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Gibbons, J. Lloyd
Gibbs, Hn A. G. H. (City of Lond.
Godson, Sir Augustus Fred.
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Rt Hn G J (St. George's
Goschen, George J. (Sussex)
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Gull, Sir Cameron
Hamilton, Rt. Hon Lord George
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hedderwick, Thomas Chas. H.
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Robert Trotter
Hoare, Sir Samuel (Norwich)
Holland, William Henry
Houston, R. P.
Jackson, Rt. Hn. Wm. Lawies
Kay-Shuttleworth, Rt Hn Sir U
Kearley, Hudson E.
Keswick, William
Lambert, George
Lawrence, Sir E. Durning-(Corn
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cum'land
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Lowles, John
Macartney, W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Monckton, Edward Philip
Monk, Charles James
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, Hon. F. (Monm'thsh.
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, Jas. A. (Wilts., S.)
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)
Muntz, Philip A.
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)
Murray, C. J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Parkes, Ebenezer
Phillpotts, Captain Arthur
Plunkett, Rt. Hn Horace Curz'n
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Purvis, Robert
Rankin, Sir James
Remnant, James Farquharson
Rentoul, James Alexander
Richardson, Sir T. (Hartlepool
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridley, Rt. Hon. Sir Matt. W.
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Robson, William Snowdon
Russell, T. W. (Tyrone)
Saunderson, Rt Hon Col Edw. J.
Seeley, Charles Hilton
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, James Parker (Lanark)
Stanley, Edward J. (Somerset)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Warde, Lieut-Col. C. E. (Kent)
Wentworth, B. C. Vernon-
Williams, J. Powell- (Birm.)
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, George
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Sir William Walrond and
Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allison, Robert Andrew
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Austin, M. (Limerick, W.)
Bainbridge, Emerson
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Billson, Alfred
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Bond, Edward
Bonsor, Henry Cosmo Orme
Bousfield, William Robert
Clark, Dr. G. B.
Cooke, C. W. Radcliffe (Heref'd)
Doogan, P. C.
Duckworth, James
Emmott, Alfred
Fenwick, Charles
Foster, Harry S. (Suffolk)
Green, W. D. (Wednesbury)
Hayden, John Patrick
Healy, Maurice (Cork)
Healy, Timothy M. (N. Louth)

Hoare, Ed. Brodie (Hampstead)
Horniman, Frederick John
Howard, Joseph
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
Lea, Sir Thomas (Londonderry
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Lonsdale. John Brownlee
Lough, Thomas
Macaleese, Daniel
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Ghee, Richard
M'Leod, John
Milward, Colonel Victor
Morgan, W Pritchard (Merthyr
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Oldroyd, Mark
Pease, H. Pike (Darlington)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Provand, Andrew Dryburgh
Reckitt, Harold James
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Samuel, J. (Stockton-on-Tees)
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Steadman, William Charles
Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)
Tanner, Charles Kearns
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wedderburn, Sir William
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Sydney Gedge and Mr. Faithfull Begg.

Words inserted.

MR. HENDERSON (Staffordshire, W.) said that the effect of the Amendment he had to move was to treat all underwriters in the same way. It was a fact that to-day a colonial or a foreign issue might be dealt with in this way without disclosing the fact. Why should they make a distinction between a colonial or a foreign company and the interests of an English company? Suppose a company already in existence determined upon making a new issue for the purpose of purchasing some additional property. That property might be purchasable to-day, but before the company could get its money to effect the purchase it had to call its shareholders together, which would take from seven to fourteen days. The company would have to hold a confirmatory meeting, and at least a month would lapse between the time the company was in a position to obtain the money by publication. That company might go to the underwriters who would for a small commission agree to underwrite the transaction, and then the company could proceed at once to make its bargain. Therefore it was essential that this underwriting should be done, and where the commission was a small one he did not see why the issue should be prejudiced by disclosure. That it would be prejudiced was clearly proved by the fact that it is not uncommon to find it stated in prospectuses as an inducement to the public to subscribe that no part of the capital has been underwritten. Therefore the effect of disclosing that the capital had been underwritten must be detrimental. Where a large commission of a very excessive character was paid it should be disclosed, for that would do away with a good deal of fraud and dishonesty, but where the sum paid did not exceed two and a-half per cent. he did not think it was necessary to disclose it. He thought the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill might very well accept the words of his Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 4, after the first word 'and,' to insert the words 'in case the said commission, with brokerage, exceeds two and a half per cent. are.'"—(*Mr. Henderson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. RITCHIE: I can assure my hon. friend that if I could possibly see my way I should be only too glad to accept his proposal. I will briefly state the reasons why I think it would be unwise for the Committee to accept this Amendment. The effect of it would be to create two classes of underwriters, one class disclosed and the other class not disclosed. You would thus divide companies into two categories, and the effect might very well be to leave an impression on the public mind that those companies which did not disclose were really of a superior kind to those companies which did disclose—which paid a brokerage of over 2½ per cent., and consequently were obliged to disclose. I think that would give an erroneous impression, because it might be just as reasonable to pay 4 or 5 per cent. in one case as to pay 2½ per cent. in another. It is clear that there is in some cases a greater element of risk, but that does not imply that one company is necessarily a better company than the other because it has been underwritten at a smaller rate. There is no slur attached to any company which pays a commission of 5 per cent. It is quite clear that the drawing of this distinction between companies paying 2½ per cent. and not disclosing and companies paying 5 per cent. and dis-

closing would involve an invidious comparison between the two companies. That is the reason why I think it would be unwise to accept the Amendment of my hon. friend, and I hope he will not press it.

MR. CAWLEY (Lancashire, Prestwich): I really cannot see that the right hon. Gentleman has given any argument against this proposal at all. If the public discriminate by the fact that only 2½ per cent. is paid, then they are very much the gainers, because anybody who knows anything about company promoting knows that no large financial firm would take over the responsibility of a large issue at 2½ per cent. unless it was a good company which would commend itself to the public generally. I think the right hon. Gentleman's argument in regard to discriminating between 2½ per cent. and a larger commission tells in favour of the Amendment. In several cases it may be imperative for certain companies to have money at a certain time, and if they are to go to a large issuing office and tell them that they want the money immediately, and that the underwriting will have to be disclosed, that prejudices them before the public, and they have to pay a larger amount for underwriting. Therefore, I think the Amendment ought to recommend itself to the House, and I shall be extremely glad to support it. Underwriting is an assurance that the issue will go on, and as far as I know it is a very legitimate thing to have an insurance for a large issue.

MR. PHILIPPS: I hope the Government will see their way to accept the Amendment moved by the hon. Member for West Staffordshire, who is an authority upon this class of business. From such experience as I have had, I am convinced that the hon. Gentleman is right when he says that with high class established companies the fact that they should be compelled to disclose when a commission larger than 2½ per cent. was paid would be detrimental to the success of those high class companies and would act as a check to a class of business which we ought to encourage rather than discourage. The right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill said, if we accepted this Amendment it would lead to two classes of underwriting, and that you would have disclosed and undisclosed underwriting. I do not know whether the Attorney General fondly imagines that by this clause he is going to limit the question to disclosed and undisclosed underwriting. I am convinced that if this clause becomes law as it stands, it is going to open the door to more swindles than the Bill itself is going to stop. It has to be remembered that in dealing with company promoters you are dealing with one of the cleverest and one of the most unscrupulous classes in the country. The right hon. Gentleman said some little time ago that it would be a most excellent thing for a company to be able to say in its prospectus that it had paid five per cent. for issuing its capital. Supposing a manufacturing concern is issued to the public in £1 shares, and the directors say in perfect good faith in the prospectus that they have underwritten the £1 shares to the extent of 3d. a share. In that case it would have a very good effect on the public, and would induce them to subscribe. What is going to prevent the promoter of a shady company from letting the directors pay one and a quarter per cent. while he pays the rest himself?

MR. LOUGH said he thought that the Amendment was a very moderate one, and that the House did not realise the careful limit which was embodied in it. Any hon. Member who had listened to the speeches must have felt that if the Amendment were not accepted a certain class of very good business would be put a stop to. Supposing that half a million of money were required, a prospectus could not be got out in an hour or a day, but the money could be obtained in a few hours by paying brokerage. The right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill seemed to think that a statement in the prospectus that brokerage had been paid would prejudice the issue; but people would say when they read that statement that they would also take shares if they got 2½ per cent. brokerage, but they could not then get it, because it had been paid for getting the money perhaps months before. That was the worst of such skilfully drawn clauses. They often interfered with business that was not fraudulent or undesirable, and he thought the House should consider well before rejecting the Amendment.

MR. BOUSFIELD said that the arguments which had been used in favour of the Amendment were in his opinion rather against it. It was urged that if 2½ per cent. brokerage had been paid, and if that fact were published in the prospectus, it would prejudice the success of the issue. It seemed to him that if such a statement of fact did prejudice the issue it ought to be disclosed to the public. According to the hypothesis of the hon. Members who supported the Amendment, if he read the prospectus without knowing that the shares had been underwritten, he might subscribe, but if he did know he would not subscribe. The clause only made certain things legal which were hitherto illegal, and it was quite right to impose on a company the obligation of stating in its prospectus that a commission had been paid.

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 44 ; Noes, 128. (Division List No. 237.)

AYES.

Austin, M. (Limerick, W.)
Bainbridge, Emerson
Banbury, Frederick George
Billson, Alfred
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Bonsor, Henry Cosmo Orme
Charrington, Spencer
Clark, Dr. G. B.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Sir John Chas. Ready
Doogan, P. C.
Duckworth, James
Foster, Harry S. (Suffolk)
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H. (Cy of Lond.
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Healy, Timothy M. (N. Louth)
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cumb'land
Lea, Sir Thomas (Londonderry)
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Lough, Thomas
Macaleese, Daniel
M'Ghee, Richard
M'Leod, John
Morgan, W. P. (Merthyr)
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
Muntz, Philip A.
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Provand, Andrew Dryburgh
Remnant, James Farquharson
Samuel, J. (Stockton-on-Tees)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Steadman, William Charles
Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)
Tanner, Charles Kearns
Wedderburn, Sir William
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Henderson and Mr. Cawley.

NOES.

Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (Leeds)
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol
Begg, Ferdinand Faithfull
Bemrose, Sir Henry Howe
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bethell, Commander
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bousfield, William Robert
Brodrick, Rt. Hn. St. John
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Butcher, John George
Caldwell, James
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbys.
Cecil, Evelyn (Hertford, East)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Cooke, C. W. R. (Hereford)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Crombie, John William
Cross, H. Shepherd (Bolton)
Curzon, Viscount
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Dyke, Rt. Hon Sir William Hart
Emmott, Alfred
Faber, George Denison
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Rbt. Penrose-
Fitz Wygram, General Sir F.
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Gedge, Sydney
Gibbons, J. Lloyd
Godson, Sir Augustus Fred.
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir J. Eldon
Goschen, Rt Hn G J (St George's
Goschen, George J. (Sussex)
Green, W. D. (Wednesbury)
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Gull, Sir Cameron
Hamilton, Rt. Hon. Lord Geo.
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert W.
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Healey, Maurice (Cork)
Hedderwick, Thomas Charles H
Hoare, Edw. Brodie (Hampste'd
Holland, William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Houston, R. P.
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh'
Kay-Shuttleworth, Rt Hn Sir U
Kearley, Hudson E.
Lambert, George
Lawrence, Sir E. Durning-(Corn
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks)
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowles, John
Macartney, W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Marks, Henry Hananel
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Milward, Colonel Victor
Monckton, Edward Philip
Monk, Charles James
More, Robt. J. (Shropshire)
Morgan, Hn. F. (Monm'thsh.
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, J. A. (Wilts., S.)
Morton, Arthur H. A (Deptford)
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Oldroyd, Mark
Phillpotts, Captain Arthur
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plunkett, Rt Hn Horace Curzon
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Purvis, Robert
Rankin, Sir James
Reckitt, Harold James
Rentoul, James Alexander
Richards, Henry Charles

Richardson, Sir T. (Hartlep'l.)	Stanley, Edw. Jas. (Somerset	Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Ridley, Rt. Hn. Sir Matthew W.	Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart	Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson	Sturt, Hon. Humphrey N.	Wrightson, Thomas
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)	Tollemache, Henry James	Wylie, Alexander
Robson, William Snowdon	Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray	Wyndham, George
Russell, T. W. (Tyrone)	Tuke, Sir John Batty	Young, Commander (Berks, E.
Sharpe, William Edward T.	Walton, John L. (Leeds, S.)	
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)	Warde, Lt.-Col. C. E. (Kent)	TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)	Williams, Jos. Powell- (Birm.	Sir William Walrond and
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)	Willox, Sir John Archibald	Mr. Anstruther.

*MR. LAWSON WALTON: The Amendment which I now move provides that "where no prospectus is issued a memorandum complying with the terms of this section shall be filed." The House will have observed that the machinery of this Bill provides that the prospectus of a company should contain certain particulars, and that the discipline which is exercised by the Bill, is exercised largely by means of the prospectus. It is necessary that the prospectus shall contain the names of the vendors, the amount of the purchase-money and various other particulars, and after the prospectus has been issued to the public, there is a provision that it must be filed. There are, therefore, two steps to be taken for the public protection. One is the issue of prospectus containing certain information, and the second is the filing of the prospectus, giving the documentary history of the company, and the first steps which were taken with reference to it. The result is that two classes of the community receive valuable assistance—one, the persons who are appealed to to subscribe for shares, and the other, the persons who might be invited to give credit to the company. There is a door, however, in the provision which I hope to close. There is a large number of companies that issue no prospectuses, because it is inconvenient, and the promoters may be able to place the capital by some other means. The syndicate which forms the company manages by means of personal recommendation to place its original capital, and having placed its original capital, it is then enabled to create a market for the shares, and the mere transactions on the market and the quotations of the shares advertise the company, and the public are drawn in without knowing anything about it except that the shares are being dealt in and are likely to go to a premium. That is the state of things under the existing law, and it will be enormously increased by the present Bill, which imposes such stringent restrictions on the issue of prospectuses. If under the existing law there are a number of companies which issue no prospectuses, how many more will not come before the public without the instrumentality of a prospectus when under this Bill various stringent requirements must be complied with by all persons issuing documents of that kind. Therefore I propose to check the abuse by enabling any shareholder or creditor to find out the history, main features, and formation of such companies. A company is registered, its shares are placed, but without this Amendment there will be no record filed of the original shareholders or directors, or the subscribed capital, or any of the particulars that are required to be given in a prospectus. What I propose is that where a company issues no prospectus, a memorandum compiled under the requirements of this section shall be placed upon record, and shall be accessible to every shareholder who may have bought shares in the company, and to every person who may, perhaps, have given credit to the company. We have what has been described already as one man companies. The one man company is a private concern; it does not issue its capital to the public, and all the shares are held by one man and by one or two other persons under his control. There is a case of a one-man company which will be found in the House of Lords Reports for 1897. It is the case of Solomon v. Solomon and Co. The company had a capital of 30,007 shares, of which 30,000 were held by Mr. Solomon and the remaining seven by seven of his nominees. Not only did Mr. Solomon hold all the share capital, but he also held £20,000 of debentures, and he controlled the company with respect to all its transactions and in relation to the whole of its profits. Under this Bill, unless my Amendment is adopted, such a condition of things will not be recorded, and a company not issuing a prospectus will not come within the operation of this section. The transactions will be carried out in

complete secrecy, and at a subsequent date, after the shares have been placed on the market, a shareholder may say, "I want to know something about this company. Had it ever a prospectus?" and the answer will be, "I do not know." Then the shareholder may ask, "Under what circumstances was it issued?" and the answer will be, "No one can tell." There is no memorandum available either for the information of subsequent investors or, what may be more important to the community, to enable traders to ascertain whether they are dealing with a company which is responsible for its debts. It is said that this Amendment will press hardly on honest private companies. Assuming that a private company places its capital without issuing a prospectus, I ask the House to consider whether, with perhaps one exception, any of the requirements of this section are such as any honest company could object to. For instance, no honest company would object to stating the names of its shareholders, how many shares had been allotted, and other similar information. But even if there is some secrecy in regard to these matters, is it not reasonable that these companies, for the very great advantage they obtain in the way of limiting their liability, should conform to some standard of publicity as regards their origin? If a private concern seeks to have the immense advantage of limiting its liability, should it not give to the public some information with regard to its formation, and enable traders to judge whether or not a concern to which they are invited to give credit is or is not responsible? I hope the House will not lightly dismiss this Amendment. I am quite sure that many Members regard it as vital to the Bill, and I feel satisfied that unless you distinctly intimate to future company promoters that this information must be given either by means of a memorandum or in a prospectus you will leave the investor in the future quite as much in the dark as to a company's origin as he is at present, and will give the creditor no means of obtaining the information to which he is entitled, and which he will obtain if this Amendment is adopted.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 33, after the word 'filed,' to insert as a new sub-section the words '(4) Where no prospectus is issued a memorandum complying with the terms of this section shall be filed in manner aforesaid.'"—(*Mr. Lawson Walton.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: I would point out to the House that we would be occasioning very considerable hardship if we were to impose all the requirements of Section 12 on a very large and respectable class of companies which are solely private companies. They would resent being required to give these particulars. My hon. and learned friend says that if we do not require such a statement as he suggests we leave the door open to very great abuse. We have endeavoured to provide by Section 12 for the protection of the public whenever a prospectus is issued, and when the public are invited to subscribe for shares. The argument of my hon. and learned friend is that companies will endeavour to avoid the requirements of Section 12 by having no prospectus at all, that all the shares will be allotted to the promoter or an agent of his, and that then the promoter will sell the shares on the Stock Exchange, and that by that means a market will be created for them. The trick against which my hon. and learned friend wishes to guard is not a very common one, although it has come before the courts on certain occasions. If my hon. and learned friend apprehends that shoddy companies will avoid the issue of prospectuses in order that their shares may be put upon the market by the promoters, the Amendment will not meet the case. The public will look askance at any undertaking launched in that way, and I would ask the House not to accept the proposal, which would put upon perfectly respectable people a burden they would very much resent, in order to prevent a possible evil, the extent of which I think has been very greatly exaggerated. I think the House will agree with me that the evil is one which will tend to cure itself, because if a shady company appears without a prospectus the public will avoid it, and for these reasons I trust the House will not accept the Amendment.

*MR. MARKS said that the view of the public with regard to companies which did not issue prospectuses was not quite

the same as the Attorney General seemed to imagine. On the contrary, the company which issued a prospectus did not stand in such great favour with the speculating public as the company which did not. There was a certain charm about mystery, and the public were induced by this, that, and the other rumour to rush in and buy certain shares, so that when the inevitable collapse came it was impossible to bring home the responsibility to the authors of the scheme. He therefore considered the suggestion embodied in the Amendment of the hon. and learned Member for South Leeds to be an admirable one in itself, and one which was vital to the perfection of the scheme before the House. The public which required protection was not the public assailed with prospectuses. A prospectus could be laid before experienced people; contracts might be inspected, and inquiries made; but when no prospectus whatever was issued the public were at the mercy of the hidden promoter, and that was the class of company in regard to which people required to be protected. But the Bill before the House gave no protection whatever in that direction. They were told that if any attempt was made to deal with this obvious evil, they would be unduly oppressing purely private companies. What was a purely private company? There were many companies founded to take over the businesses of well-established firms, and the bulk of the shares were distributed amongst the partners in the firm, very few reaching the customers and the general public. So long as the business was profitable the company continued to be a private company, but as soon as the profits commenced to decline the company began gradually to become a public company. One might sometimes test the good faith of the so-called private company by the announcement made in the prospectus that a quotation and settlement would be applied for on the Stock Exchange. If the public were to be protected from this class of scheme, there must be something in the nature of a memorandum filed at the time of the registration of the company. That memorandum need not be of an exhaustive character or reveal any sacred secrets of a private business. It might merely set forth the name of the person who sold the business, the date of the sale, the price paid, how much of that price was in cash and how much in shares, and the class and numbers of the shares devoted to the purchase-money. The public, if they bought those shares in the market in the future, would then be able to ascertain whether they were buying vendor's shares or not. A few such precautions, without acting detrimentally to genuine private companies, would serve to protect the public. The class of company which had fluctuated in recent years more than any other was the mining class. He believed he was correct in saying that not a single prospectus was issued in connection with any of the Barnato group, and there never was a set of companies which at one time had stood so high and afterwards come so low. He certainly hoped that some such Amendment as that before the House would be incorporated in the Bill. Such an Amendment would remove a very serious flaw in what might otherwise be an useful measure.

MAJOR JAMESON characterised the Amendment as absolute nonsense. By it the House would be legislating for one-man companies, and there was already quite enough such legislation. It seemed to be argued that private companies should have none of the privileges but all the disabilities of public companies, and he trusted the House would vote with the Government against this Amendment.

*MR. BAINBRIDGE (Lincolnshire, Gainsborough) apprehended that the intention of the Bill was to protect the ordinary speculator and investor, and he could not conceive the use of the House wasting its time in trying to protect the careless gambler. Nobody who bought shares in a Barnato company deserved to be protected by a Bill passed through the House. Such a man could not claim to have been misled; he simply saw shares rising in the market, and, without any information, made up his mind to speculate in them. The House would not be justified in spending time in protecting people of that class.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 35; Noes, 107. (Division List No. 238.)

AYES.

Austin, M. (Limerick, W.)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Caldwell, James
Cawley, Frederick
Clark, Dr. G. B.
Crombie, John William
Doogan, P. C.
Duckworth, James
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Healey, Maurice (Cork)
Healy, Timothy M. (N. Louth)
Hedderwick, Thos. Charles H.
Horniman, Frederick John
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
Lawson, Sir W. (Cumb'land)
Macaleese, Daniel
M'Arthur, Wm. (Cornwall)
Marks, Henry Hananel
Morton, Ed. J. C. (Devonport)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Pease, Herb. Pike (Darlington)
Provand, Andrew Dryburgh
Reckitt, Harold James
Remnant, James Farquharson
Richards, Henry Charles
Samuel, J. (Stockton-on-Tees)
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)
Wedderburn, Sir William
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Mr. Lawson Walton and
Mr. Billson.

NOES.

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bainbridge, Emerson
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol)
Begg, Ferdinand Faithfull
Bemrose, Sir Henry Howe
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bousfield, William Robert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Charrington, Spencer
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Cooke, C. W. Radcliffe (Heref'd)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Curzon, Viscount
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Dyke, Rt. Hon Sir William Hart
Emmott, Alfred
Faber, George Denison
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitz Wygram, General Sir F.
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Foster, Harry S. (Suffolk)
Gedge, Sydney
Gibbons, J. Lloyd
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H (City of Lond.
Godson, Sir Augustus F.
Goschen, Rt Hn G J. (St George's
Goschen, George J. (Sussex)
Green, W. D. (Wednesbury)
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Gull, Sir Cameron
Hamilton, Rt. Hon. Lord G.
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert W.
Henderson, Alexander
Holland, William Henry
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Keswick, William
Lawrence, Sir E. Durning-(Corn
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks.)
Lea, Sir Thomas (Londonderry)
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lough, Thomas
Lowe, Francis William
Lowles, John
Macartney, W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Milward, Colonel Victor
Monckton, Edward Philip
Monk, Charles James
More, Robert J. (Shropshire)
Morgan, Hn. F. (Monmouthsh.
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James A. (Wilts., S.)
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Chas. J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Phillpotts, Capt. Arthur
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plunkett, Rt Hn Horace Curzon
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Purvis, Robert
Rankin, Sir James
Rentoul, James Alexander
Richardson, Sir T. (Hartlep'l)
Ridley, Rt. Hn. Sir Matthew W.
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Charles T.
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Russell, T. W. (Tyrone)
Seely, Charles Hilton
Smith, Jas. Parker (Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand
Stanley, Edward J. (Somerset)
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Tanner, Charles Kearns
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E. (Kent
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hon. E. R. (B'th
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, George
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Sir William Walrond and
Mr. Anstruther.

*MR. SYDNEY GEDGE: I rise now [12.15] to move the adjournment of the debate. I think that the Government have done a very good day's work indeed. Many of us have been here since noon.

*MR. SPEAKER: When the House has agreed to suspend the Twelve o'clock Rule it is not the custom for the Chair to accept a motion of this kind so soon after midnight.

*MR. SYDNEY GEDGE: We have to meet again to-morrow at twelve o'clock, and in those circumstances I think the Government might consent to an adjournment. Eleven clauses have now been passed, and the twelfth clause is one which requires very careful consideration. The Standing Committee only reported upon this Bill on Thursday, and we actually did not get the Bill in type until yesterday morning, and we have only had one day to look into the matter. In these circumstances I think the Government might be content with their success in getting eleven clauses passed, and I hope the Government will accept this motion.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): On a point of order. Is this a Coercion Act?

*MR. SPEAKER: I have the power, under the Standing Order, either to refuse this motion, or to put it to the House forthwith. I will give the House an opportunity of saying whether they approve it or not, and I will put it to the House forthwith.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (MR. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): Do you desire, Mr. Speaker, that I should say a word, or do you wish to put the question at once?

*MR. SPEAKER: Does the right hon. Gentleman accept the motion?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No, Sir.

*MR. SPEAKER: Then I will put it to the House.

*MR. SYDNEY GEDGE: I have no wish to go to a division.

Question put—

"That further proceeding on consideration, as amended, be now adjourned."

The House divided:—Ayes, 32; Noes, 101. (Division List No. 239.)

AYES.

Austin, M. (Limerick, W.)
Bainbridge, Emerson
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Billson, Alfred
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Cawley, Frederick
Charrington, Spencer
Crombie, John William
Doogan, P. C.
Emmott, Alfred
Foster, Harry S. (Suffolk)
Gedge, Sydney
Gibbons, J. Lloyd
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
Hedderwick, Thomas C. H.
Horniman, Frederick John
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cum'land
Lea, Sir Thomas (Londonderry)
Macaleese, Daniel
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
Provand, Andrew Dryburgh
Reckitt, Harold James
Shaw, Chas. Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick, B.)
Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)
Tanner, Charles Kearns
Ure, Alexander
Walton, Jno. Lawson (Leeds S.
Wedderburn, Sir William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Mr. Lough and Mr. Billson

NOES.

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol
Bemrose, Sir Henry Howe
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bousfield, William Robert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Cooke, C. W. Radcliffe (Heref'd)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Curzon, Viscount
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir Wm. Hart
Faber, George Denison
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitz Wygram, General Sir F.
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H. (Cy of Lond.
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Goschen, Rt Hn G J (St George's
Goschen, Geo. J. (Sussex)
Green, W. D. (Wednesbury)
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Gull, Sir Cameron
Hamilton, Rt. Hon. Lord G.
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert W.
Hayden, John Patrick
Healy, Maurice (Cork)
Healy, Timothy M. (N. Louth
Henderson, Alexander
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.
Keswick, William
Lawrence, Sir E. D. (Cornw'll)
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks)
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Macartney, W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Milward, Colonel Victor
Monckton, Edward Philip
More, Robt. J. (Shropshire)
Morgan, Hn. Fred. (Monmouth.
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James A. (Wilts., S.)
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute
Murray, Chas. J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Nicol, Donald Ninian
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Pease, Herb. Pike (Darlington
Philipotts, Captain Arthur
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plunkett, Rt. Hon. H. Curzon
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Purvis, Robert
Rankin, Sir James
Remnant, James Farquharson
Rentoul, James Alexander
Richards, Henry Charles
Richardson, Sir T. (Hartlep'l)
Ridley, Rt. Hn. Sir Matthew W.
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Russell, T. W. (Tyrone)
Seely, Charles Hilton
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Edward J. (Somerset)
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Tomlinson, William E. Murray
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E. (Kent)
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Woodhouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, George
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Sir William Walrond and
Mr. Anstruther.

MR. H. S. FOSTER moved to omit from Clause 12 the provision that every prospectus must contain the names, description, and addresses of the signatories to the Memorandum of Association and the number of shares subscribed for by

them respectively. The prospectus already had to contain a vast number of clauses giving general information. As a matter of fact, the Memorandum was so extensive that it had to be printed in very small type, and it was doubtful whether one person in 10,000 ever read it. It was therefore absurd to require to be added to that the information here provided for, which was perfectly unnecessary, of no value, and would minimise the value of the other information for which the clause provided.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 37, to leave out the words from the word 'association,' to the word 'the,' in line 39."—(*Mr. H. S. Foster.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

MR. RITCHIE was of opinion that this information ought to be given to the public in a prospectus.

MR. BRODIE HOARE: Why should it be given?

MR. RITCHIE: For information.

MR. BOUSFIELD did not think anybody would pay the slightest attention to the persons who signed the Memorandum, as they were usually solicitors' clerks, and there was really no importance attached to it. This certainly was a very trivial matter.

*MR. SYDNEY GEDGE said there was a very good reason for not burdening a prospectus with valueless information. The more stuff was put in the less likely were people to read it. What was desired was that the pith of the matter should be given. If he desired to take people in he should put into the prospectus every possible bit of nonsense, because then the people would tire of reading it.

*MR. BAINBRIDGE thought nothing existed in a prospectus more weighty than the names therein given, and certainly it would take away from their value if the prospectus were crowded with names which were absolutely unimportant.

MAJOR JAMESON cordially agreed with the Amendment. If everything the right hon. Gentleman desired was inserted the prospectus would extend to greater length than the New Testament, and to put in line after line which would not have the slightest meaning to the persons concerned was most absurd. The only persons who would benefit by such information being given were newspaper proprietors, who received 1s. 6d. per line for advertising the prospectuses, but surely that was not the desire of the President of the Board of Trade. So far from people being kept out of difficulty by having line after line of this rigmarole put in, they would be plunged in deeper and deeper, and not the slightest good would result. The House should, as business men, support the Amendment.

MR. LOWE (Birmingham, Edgbaston) joined in the appeal that the Amendment should be accepted. His experience was that the signatories of the Memorandum were not looked upon as at all material; whether a person took five or 500 shares, he usually signed simply for one share, and this information would not be of the slightest value.

MR. BILLSON (Halifax) said the reason the Memorandum was usually signed by obscure persons was that it was merely a matter of convenience, but if this provision was made pains would be taken in future that persons having a real interest in the concern should sign. As to benefiting newspaper proprietors, the clause did not require that the names should be advertised, but merely that the prospectus should contain them. Usually an abridged prospectus was advertised, so there was no force in that objection.

MR. LOUGH believed the advertisement of an abridged prospectus was always looked upon with suspicion. The argument that substantial signatories would be obtained simply because they would be published was purely conjectural. Not a single word had been said in favour of the clause, and he thought the Government, in deference to their many supporters who had spoken against this clause, should give some further reason for resisting this Amendment. If the Solicitor General could give some legal reason of any kind for this extraordinary proposal it might not be necessary to go to a division.

MR. T. M. HEALY said this Amendment raised a very important question, which was emphasised by the statement of the hon. Member in regard to abridged prospectuses. If the hon. Member would refer to the definition of prospectus in Clause 34 he would find the following explanation—

"The expression 'prospectus' means any prospectus, notice, circular, advertisement, or other invitation offering to the public for subscription or purchase any shares or debentures of a company."

Any advertisement issued must contain all the matter provided for in that clause.

Question put.

The House divided: — Ayes, 102; Noes, 18. (Division List No. 240.)

AYES.

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John	Fletcher, Sir Henry	Nicol, Donald Ninian
Austin, M. (Limerick, W.)	Flower, Ernest	Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r	Gibbons, J. Lloyd	Phillpotts, Captain Arthur
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds	Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H. (City of Lon.	Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Banbury, Frederick George	Godson, Sir Augustus Fred.	Plunkett, Rt Hn Horace Curzon
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol	Goschen, Rt Hn G. J (St George's	Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Bemrose, Sir Henry Howe	Goschen, George J. (Sussex)	Purvis, Robert
Billson, Alfred	Green, Walford D (Wednesbury	Reckitt, Harold James
Blundell, Colonel Henry	Greville, Hon Ronald	Rentoul, James Alexander
Bond, Edward	Gull, Sir Cameron	Richards, Henry Charles
Bousfield, William Robert	Hamilton, Rt. Hn. Lord George	Richardson, Sir Thos. (Hartlepl
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John	Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.	Ridley, Rt. Hn. Sir Matthew W
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James	Hayne, Rt. Hn. Charles Seale-	Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Caldwell, James	Henderson, Alexander	Russell, T. W. (Tyrone)
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.	Horniman, Frederick John	Seely, Charles Hilton
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.	Jones, William (Carnarv'nshire	Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)	Lawrence, Sir E. Durning- (Corn	Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J (Birm.	Lawson, John Grant (Yorks.)	Smith, James Parker (Lanarks)
Chamberlain, J. A. (Worc'r.)	Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie	Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry	Lonsdale, John Brownlee	Stanley, Ewd. Jas. (Somerset)
Charrington, Spencer	Macartney, W. G. Ellison	Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse	Macdona, John Cumming	Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Cooke, C. W. Radcliffe (Heref'd	M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool	Walton, J. Lawson (Leeds, S.)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)	Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.	Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E. (Kent)
Crombie, John William	Melville, Beresford Valentine	Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton	Milward, Colonel Victor	Willox, Sir John Archibald
Curzon, Viscount	Monckton, Edward Philip	Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph	More, R. Jasper (Shropshire)	Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-	Morgan, Hn. Fred. (Monm'thsh.	Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Emmott, Alfred	Morrell, George Herbert	Wrightson, Thomas
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edwd.	Morrison, James A. (Wilts, S.)	Wylie, Alexander
Finch, George H.	Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)	Wyndham, George
Finlay, Sir Robt. Bannatyne	Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute	TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Fisher, William Hayes	Murray, Chas. J. (Coventry)	Sir William Walrond and
FitzGerald, Sir R. Penrose-	Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)	Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Bainbridge, Emerson	Lea, Sir Thomas (Londondy.)	Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)
Doogan, P. C.	Lough, Thomas	Tanner, Charles Kearns
Foster, Harry S. (Suffolk)	Lowe, Francis William	Ure, Alexander
Hayden, John Patrick	Macaleese, Daniel	Wedderburn, Sir William
Healy, Maurice (Cork)	M'Arthur, William (Cornwall	TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Healy, Timothy M. (N. Louth	O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)	Major Jameson and Mr.
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cumb'land	Provand, Andrew Dryburgh	T. D. Bolton.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, line 34, after the word 'specifying,' to insert the words 'if possible.'"—(*Mr. H. S. Foster.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'if possible' be there inserted."

MR. RITCHIE: It is clear that if no amount has been paid for goodwill it will not be put in, but if any amount has been paid for goodwill then it should be put in.

Question put, and negatived.

MR. BOUSFIELD proposed an Amendment in line 35. Two or three times they had had the case put which arose under Clause 10 of underwriting a company at a small rate of commission mentioned in the prospectus, while there might be behind that an underwriter at a large commission. The President of the Board of Trade had rightly stated the importance which might be attached by the public to statements of that sort. That state of things was quite misleading, because there might be an undisclosed under-

writing by a promoter at a large commission. It was urged that if there was any money paid by a promoter for underwriting it would have to be disclosed in the prospectus. There was great doubt whether that reading was correct. The clause dealt with commission paid by the company, and he rather gathered from the silence of the Government on the point that the provision did not deal with the case of underwriting paid by the promoter. The opinion of the House, as shown in the discussion, was certainly that the prospectus should contain a statement of all underwriting, and if that was also the intention of the Government it ought to be made clear. He therefore moved to insert after the word "paid" the words " by any person."

Amendment proposed—

" In page 7, line 35, after the word 'paid,' to insert the words 'by any person.'" —(*Mr. Bousfield.*)

Question proposed, " That those words be there inserted."

MR. RITCHIE: These words would not, I think,, in any way alter the meaning of the clause, but if my hon. and learned friend desires to have it explicitly stated I have no objection.

MR. BAINBRIDGE said the amount of commission paid might not be known to the person issuing the prospectus, and therefore by passing this Amendment the House might be asking for particulars of which the person issuing the prospectus had no knowledge whatever.

MR. RITCHIE suggested that the Amendment should be withdrawn. He would undertake that the point should be considered, and if necessary a provision inserted in another place.

MR. H. S. FOSTER pointed out that underwriting might be, and usually was, done after the prospectus had been settled and passed by the directors. In such a case it would manifestly be impossible for the directors to specify the amount of underwriting commission.

*MR. SYDNEY GEDGE said that when the question of underwriting was being discussed Members were told it did not matter what the promoter might do, because the money would not come out of the pocket of the company. The promoter avowedly added a certain amount of money to the fair price of the property he was selling, because he undertook all the preliminary expenses, including underwriting. But now the company was empowered to underwrite it would be very improper for any such addition to be made to the amount paid to the vendor in that respect, and therefore the directors would always have to show that only the fair value was being given for the property or contract purchased. If the principle was introduced that the vendor also might pay for underwriting the House would be legalising a practice which was much better not legalised, and taking away the one safeguard the public had that only a fair price was being paid.

MR. RITCHIE thought the observations of the last speaker were very much to the point, and he would take care that nothing was done which would in any way affect the point he had raised.

MR. LAWSON WALTON said their present position showed the extreme difficulty of discussing a highly complicated measure in the early hours of the morning; it was almost impossible to understand the meaning of some of these Amendments, and Amendments to Amendments. He failed to see how it was possible to ensure payments by the promoter being put in the prospectus.

MR. RITCHIE explained that all he had promised was that the point should be considered.

MAJOR JAMESON objected to the withdrawal of the Amendment. The present confusion was the direct result of the attempt to run the Bill through the House at such an hour. First the right hon. Gentleman agreed to accept the Amendment, and then he said he would not. The only result of a great many of the Amendments which had been made would be to give business to the lawyers, and he could therefore understand learned Members being in favour of them.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Other Amendments made.

Further proceedings on Consideration, as amended, adjourned till To-morrow.

Motion made, and Question " That this House do now adjourn"— (*Sir William Walrond*)—put, and agreed to.

Adjourned at a quarter after One of the clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 25th July, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

SOUTH EASTERN METROPOLITAN TRAMWAYS BILL.

PORTLAND URBAN DISTRICT GAS BILL.

Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

LIVERPOOL OVERHEAD RAILWAY BILL [Lords].

A verbal Amendment made; Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

NORTH EASTERN RAILWAY BILL [Lords].

As amended, to be considered To-morrow.

NORTH EASTERN RAILWAY (STEAM VESSELS) BILL [Lords].

As amended, considered.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

HEMEL HEMPSTEAD CORPORATION (WATER) BILL [Lords]. (BY ORDER.)

As amended, considered; an Amendment made; Bill to be read the third time.

FRASER SETTLED CHATTELS BILL [Lords].

Read a second time, and committed.

BOURNEMOUTH CORPORATION BILL [Lords].

Ordered, That Standing Order 211 be suspended, and that the Committee on the Bournemouth Corporation Bill [Lords] have leave to sit and proceed forthwith.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

EDUCATION BOARD PROVISIONAL ORDER CONFIRMATION (LONDON) BILL [Lords].

Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

PETITIONS.

LICENSED PREMISES (HOURS OF SALE) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Cupar, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (No. 2) BILL.

Petition from West Ham, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

MARRIAGE ACT, 1898.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 18th June; *Mr. Price*]; to lie upon the Table.

NATIONAL GALLERY (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Report of the Director of the National Gallery of Ireland to the Board of Governors and Guardians for the year 1899 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

METRIC SYSTEM (FOREIGN COUNTRIES) (COMMERCIAL, No. 3, 1900).

Copy presented, of Reports from Her Majesty's Representatives in Europe on the Metric System, Part I. [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 2,485 to 2,487 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Second Report, with Minutes of Evidence and an Appendix, brought up, and read.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 298.]

PUBLIC PETITIONS COMMITTEE.

Ninth Report brought up, and read; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

RESERVE FORCES BILL [Lords].

As amended, considered.

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid): I wish to call attention to Sub-section (*b*)

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

of Clause 2, and to ask your opinion, Mr. Speaker, whether it is in order, or whether it is not necessary that the matter should be first dealt with by a resolution of this House. I submit that this section involves a charge on the Imperial Exchequer, and, before it can be incorporated in the Bill, there ought to be a preliminary resolution. It provides that under certain circumstances the pay of a soldier shall either be increased or reduced. It is quite true that there is the alternative of reduction, but I think it may be assumed that the probability is that there will be an increase of pay, inasmuch as men of good character going into active service, and thereby entitling themselves to an increase of pay, are likely to be far more numerous than men whose pay will be reduced through punishment. Experience has taught us that that is the case, and, therefore, as the Bill involves a charge upon the Imperial Exchequer, I submit there ought to have been a preliminary resolution before this particular proposal is embodied in a Bill.

*Mr. SPEAKER: The Bill cannot be regarded as creating a new charge, because the possible expense ultimately involved must be included in the ordinary Estimates of the year, and will, therefore, receive the sanction of the House in due course. It is really only a statement that the pay of the soldier should be at a certain rate, and therefore it is not a matter needing a resolution, as the hon. Member suggests.

Mr. CALDWELL: Then I beg to move an Amendment providing that the Bill shall not apply to men in the second division of the first class of the Army Reserve who entered the division before "the passing of this Act," instead of before the first day of June, 1900. I believe the Government are willing to accept this Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 15, to leave out 'the first day of June, 1900,' in order to insert 'the passing of this Act.'"—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

The UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): I am quite prepared to accept this Amendment. It is a question of form rather than of substance, for, as a matter of fact, none of the Reserves called out are being transferred in the way suggested.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill read a third time, and passed, with Amendments.

SUPPLY.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1900-1901.

CLASS II.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £32,250, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Department of Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies, including a Grant in aid of certain Expenses connected with Emigration."

*Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar): About six months have elapsed since we were presented with a Blue-book in regard to South Africa. We now have had two given to us. As regards the first I do not find that it contains much information of any value, although it is a volume of considerable size. It relates to the correspondence between Lord Salisbury and President Kruger which has already been published, and for the remainder it is mainly composed of extracts from newspaper articles and of tittle-tattle. It does not put the House in possession of any information at all as to what is really going on in South Africa. The second Blue-book, I am bound to say, is of a different character. It deals with the constitutional question raised between the Home Government and the Cape Government with regard to the treatment of the rebels and as to the policy of the future. But even there the information is of a somewhat meagre description, and we have to judge very

much by inference as to what has actually occurred between the Home and the Cape Governments. As to the constitutional question, so far as it is disclosed in the Blue-book, I have no criticism to make. It seems to me that the treatment of rebels is a question both of Imperial and Colonial interest. Besides, apparently the Cape Government did invite the right hon. Gentleman the Colonial Secretary to express his view on the question of the rebels and their punishment, and he was therefore fully entitled to give it. But it appears incidentally in one memorandum, and a like inference may be drawn from other memoranda that there has been something behind what appears in the Blue-book—something behind the correspondence carried on on constitutional lines. Certain members of the Cape Cabinet appear to have entertained the idea that, unless they adopted the right hon. Gentleman's view, the Constitution of the Cape might be suspended. I should like to ask whether there is any foundation for that suggestion, because I think that is a matter entirely beyond and apart from what appears in the Blue-book. It seems to me that the Cape Government in regard to this matter—and here I refer particularly to Mr. Schreiner — were almost obliged to adopt the views, or, at all events, some of the views of the right hon. Gentleman the Colonial Secretary. And here, in regard to Mr. Schreiner, I should like to be allowed to say that this country and the Cape are to be congratulated on the fact that throughout these troublous times we have had in office at the Cape a man so obviously loyal to Great Britain. He has clearly tried to do his duty as between the Dutch party and the English party out there, and I think he deserves thoroughly well of this country and of his native country. I am not quarrelling in any way with the method adopted by the right hon. Gentleman opposite in putting his views before the Cape Government, but I do desire to offer some words of criticism in regard to those views. It certainly is a very deplorable thing that, as one of the consequences of the war, we should have to deal with something like 10,000 rebels who have been in arms against the British Crown. But the question is narrowed down to one particular class of rebel. It is generally admitted, both by the Secretary of State and the Cape Government, that those who may be called the ringleaders must be tried by some special Commission and made to suffer a penalty consonant with their crime. There is another class of rebels referred to by the right hon. Gentleman in his despatch—namely, those who can prove that they acted under strong compulsion; and I do not imagine that anyone would press for their punishment. The only ones, therefore, we have to do with are "willing" rebels, who took up arms and assisted the enemy in districts occupied by the enemy, and of which we had surrendered possession. There is a considerable distinction to be drawn between men who joined the rebels from that part of the Cape still under British control, and those who joined from the districts from which British protection had been withdrawn. To judge from Sir Alfred Milner's despatch, the number of men who gratuitously left different parts of the Cape in order to join the enemy was very small, and I think it speaks very highly for the loyalty of those whose characters have been so aspersed by men who have supported this war throughout. Of the loyalty of the English population nothing is required to be said; but I say it says much for the loyalty of the Dutch population that so very few joined the rebels, except in districts actually in possession of the enemy. I think that fact goes far to demonstrate that the alleged conspiracy of the Dutch against the English was not based on any solid foundation. I am bound to say there is one interesting despatch, in which it is shown that persons who did join the enemy actually made beforehand an appeal to Sir Alfred Milner and to the Cape Government for protection against the Orange Free State burghers, in order that they might be able to maintain their loyalty to the English Crown. But that protection was taken away, and they found themselves in a very difficult position indeed. One can hardly be surprised, although, of course, it is a matter for regret, that, in districts from which British protection had been withdrawn, and which were invaded by men of the same race, language and blood, the inhabitants were induced to take up arms against the Crown. Of course, they are to blame for so doing. But I think the chief blame for this position lies, not on these unfortunate misguided men, but on the Govern-

ment and the right hon. Gentleman, for not having taken care that such a position should not possibly arise. The opportunity for joining and the temptation to join were given entirely by the action of the Government; it was their absolute want of foresight and preparation which caused the rebellion and made these men rebels. For the first time, I believe, in British history we had English territory invaded by foreign arms; and these persons were placed in the painful position of having to choose between blood and flag. More blame, therefore, attaches to the Government than to these misguided men. I do not desire to say, however, that it is a sufficient excuse for their having taken up arms against the Crown. They will, of course, have to suffer some punishment, and it will be only fair that they should do so, for otherwise they would be in a better position than their fellow-countrymen, who remained loyal to the Crown in the same districts; and who, unfortunately, have suffered very considerably from wanton and, in some cases, I am afraid to say, spiteful confiscation of and damage done to their property—damage which no money can really compensate for, and indeed these men cannot be too highly praised for their loyalty. I therefore quite agree that the rebels in question must undergo some punishment. But I also hold that some leniency may be shown to the rank and file, and perhaps, later, amnesty too. It is obvious that, in considering the question of punishment to be meted out in such circumstances, that punishment should have three qualities. It ought not to be vindictive; it ought not to be tainted with political bias; and it ought not to be continuous, or to leave an open sore for many years to come. What does the right hon. Gentleman propose? What is it he pressed on the Cape Government, and on a very reluctant Ministry? He proposed perpetual disfranchisement for these misguided men, and I venture to suggest that such a roposal contains all the three vices to which I have referred. Whatever may be the object in the mind of the right hon. Gentleman, such a punishment will at all events be looked upon as vindictive as having a political taint, and its memory will rankle and remain for many years to come. Such a punishment as this is, it seems to me, the worst that could be inflicted at the present time, having regard to the future of the Cape.

Mr. Sydney Buxton.

I should like to draw the attention of the Committee to the irony of the situation. We went to war in order to enfranchise a certain number of British subjects. We have been told by the right hon. Gentleman in one of his speeches that he proposes to adopt the system of Crown Colony government in regard to the Transvaal and the Orange Free State. What does Crown Colony government mean? It means that those who have the franchise at present will lose it, and that those not already enfranchised will not receive it. And now he proposes, in order to carry out the policy of a war undertaken on behalf of a policy of enfranchisement, to disfranchise for life thousands of British subjects in other parts of South Africa. That seems to me to be a most curious result. It is one of the many unforeseen and unexpected outcomes of this conflict that the result of a war to increase the franchise is to disfranchise a large number of persons. I am not going to deny that, in some places and under certain conditions, wholesale disfranchisement of this sort may not be the best form, because a lenient form, of punishment that can be devised. But if ever there was a time when such a policy was bad, if ever there was a place in which it was unwise to enforce it, that time is the present, and that place is the Cape Colony. I cannot conceive a worse method, moment, or place for such punishment of rebellion. It immediately arouses suspicion as to the motives of the right hon. Gentleman and the Home Government. I am bound to say that one of the great evils of the whole position in South Africa during the last five years—since the right hon. Gentleman has been at the Colonial Office—has been the unbounded suspicion by certain sections of the community in South Africa as to his intentions and desires. I am not going to say whether those suspicions are right or wrong; that is not the question now. But surely this is the moment when the right hon. Gentleman and Sir Alfred Milner, who is more or less involved with him, should desire to allay such suspicions instead of accentuating them by widespread disfranchisement. Is there one thing more than another which would increase the suspicion than the present proposal for unlimited disfranchisement? No doubt the right hon. Gentleman will, when he speaks to-day, disclaim political or personal motives. But we had a speech

the other day from Lord James of Hereford, a member of the Cabinet, somewhat cynical in its nature, and certainly inexpedient, which, to use a vulgar phrase, "let the cat out of the bag." Lord James was talking about the war, and he laid down the proposition that "it would be the duty of the Government to see that those who were loyal, and those who obeyed the law, should be paramount in the exercise of political power." I suppose he calls that "equal rights." He added that "the destinies of these people should no longer be controlled by the votes or political actions of rebels." That may be right or wrong, but, at any rate, it shows the avowed objects and intentions of the Government in regard to this question. This is neither more nor less than political proscription. It appears to me to be a case of jerrymandering the constituencies with the object of turning a minority into a majority. We heard a good deal at one time as to the desirability of "crushing Africandism." Now, we are told that the object is to turn a Dutch majority into an English majority, and, in regard to this matter of punishment, I would like to point out that the punishment will fall less heavily on the person who committed the crime and more heavily on the party to which he belongs—on his friends and kinsfolk. It will fall on the Africander party, which has shown singular self-control and great loyalty in a very critical, dangerous, and difficult position. I do not think the right hon. Gentleman will deny that the leaders and majority of that party have exhibited great control in their action during the whole course of these unfortunate events. It seems to me you are going to punish these men, not so much because they are rebels themselves, but because by their assistance Mr. Rhodes' power was broken, the Sprigg Government was turned out, and the policy of the right hon. Gentleman was more or less thwarted. That, at any rate, will be their view of the nature of the punishment inflicted. I heard a good deal about a comparison between the present position and that which obtained in Canada after the Canadian rebellion, at the time of Lord Durham. Personally, I admit I cannot see very much analogy between the two cases. I cannot understand how the arguments applicable to the one can be applied to the other. But in the course of my reading I came across a letter some sentences in which are certainly applicable to the present position. Lord Durham, in his despatch, was dealing with the question which had been put forward of jerrymandering the Canadian constituencies, and he said:—

> "With respect to every one of these plans which propose to make the English minority an electoral majority by means of new and strange modes of voting, or unfair divisions of the country, I shall only say that, if the Canadians are to be deprived of representative government, it would be better to do it in a straightforward way than to attempt to establish a permanent system of government as the basis of what all mankind would regard as mere electoral frauds. It is not in North America that men can be cheated by an unreal semblance of representative government, or persuaded that they are outvoted when, in fact, they are disfranchised."

It seems to me that this paragraph is applicable to the present position, and I certainly cordially endorse the sentiments embodied in it. There is another point of some importance. We gather from these Blue-books that two Commissions are to be appointed to try the rebels—one a distinctly judicial Commission to deal with the ringleaders, and the other a quasi-judicial Commission to deal with the question of disfranchisement. It is suggested that the latter should consist of men free from political bias; but I venture to say that at the present moment neither in South Africa nor in this country is it possible to find a single man who could regard this matter free from political bias. However able these men may be, however much they may desire to carry out their duties, I am afraid that from the beginning they will be discredited, the Commission will be looked upon as a political organisation, and they will be subjected to a great temptation in a number of constituencies in which, by disfranchising a certain number of men, they will be able to alter the balance of political power. Therefore, instead of this proposal of the right hon. Gentleman for life-long disfranchisement diminishing the difficulties of the existing position, and being calculated to bring about peace and amity in South Africa, it will do more to accentuate the evils which unfortunately exist. I am not blaming Mr. Schreiner for adopting the suggestions of the right hon. Gentleman. He was acting under great difficulty and was subjected to considerable pressure from the Home Government. But I am blaming the right hon.

Gentleman for the excessive and provocative proposals which he made to the Cape Government. We here are not in a position to dictate to the Cape Government, but we have a right to criticise or condemn any action which may be taken by our own Government. In a sense, no doubt, it is futile to do so, because at the Cape there is now in office a Government of another persuasion which will carry out such proposals as are made to it by the Secretary of State. But I think this House of Commons has a right to express an opinion on the subject of disfranchisement. I am afraid that the position taken up by the right hon. Gentleman throws some light on the very great feeling of uneasiness which unquestionably exists both here and at the Cape as to the judicial proceedings which are taking place at the present moment. We have asked for information in regard to the civil and military courts and we have been unable to get it; indeed the right hon. Gentleman disclaims all responsibility. We want to know whether justice is being done, and we want to feel that the British power is not now being exercised in South Africa to carry out a system of persecution under the guise of civil and military law. I hope the right hon. Gentleman will be able to give the House some information as to the present operation of the Civil and Military law in South Africa. I do not think the outlook in South Africa is so rosy that we can afford, by disfranchisement or by the exercise of excessive powers, to add to the difficulties before us. The war is lingering on; no further honour or glory is to be got out of the war; the gilt is very considerably off the gingerbread. We have at present to do what we can, not to add to the difficulties that have to be met, but, as far as possible, to diminish them. I have been struck with the view which Sir Alfred Milner himself takes of the situation. The best that Sir Alfred Milner can say in regard to the outlook is that he does not "take a very gloomy view" of it. If the High Commissioner expresses himself thus, surely the outlook must be very bad and very gloomy. I only wish to add one word. It is that I do not desire on the present occasion to discuss the question of the future. It would be premature to do so. South Africa is in a state of chaos, and it is not possible for any person or Government really to decide on the matter in detail. I feel bound to say, however, that I am not prepared to contest the proposition that there must be some form of effective Imperial control in the future with regard to the Transvaal and the Orange Free State, but in what form it is to be applied it is premature to lay down. The mere fact of the war having lasted so long has made the position a more difficult one. It is obvious now that for a long time to come we must have a military occupation of the Transvaal and the Orange Free State. The long delay will give time to allow differences to diminish, and to enable us to judge more fully of the sentiments existing at the Cape and here before committing ourselves to the details of the future. We ought to consult Dutch opinion at the Cape as well as English opinion. The longer the Government can delay making up their minds with regard to the details of the future the better I, for one, shall be satisfied. I am pleading for delay, for I believe it will afford the only chance of a satisfactory solution. I am sure that the hope of every Member of the House is that the war may come as speedily as possible to a conclusion.

SIR WILFRID LAWSON (Cumberland, Cockermouth): I am glad the Government have afforded us this opportunity of discussing their policy in South Africa, and I certainly think that a debate on the salary of the Chief Secretary is quite germane, seeing that if there is one man more responsible than another for the war and all the horrors which are going on in South Africa it is the Colonial Secretary. Of course, the Government, as a whole, is responsible, but the right hon. Gentleman stands out from among them, and therefore I hold that we are fully entitled to discuss the question of his salary. The time has come when we may, so to speak, take stock and endeavour to find out what has been the real advantage to this country of this war policy. In doing so we must go back to the origin of the war. I suppose the only reason why we interfered with the Transvaal was that we thought it was badly governed. But what was the bad government? We said that the franchise was not arranged so satisfactorily as we could have wished. We said also that the rulers were corrupt; and, lastly, we complained that they chose to be governed by an oligarchy—a fact which seemed to

trouble us most tremendously. But, after all, Mr. Kruger is only a typical Tory, and was carrying out the Tory policy in South Africa. Why this country could not stand Tory principles in South Africa I never could understand. It seems to me most extraordinary that we should have set ourselves to check these abuses. We have registration laws in this country which seem to be devised specially to prevent people from getting the franchise. Half the population—the women—are excluded altogether. Then I come to the charge of corruption. We alleged that public money was being devoted to private purposes in the Transvaal, but ever since 1895 most of the time of the House of Commons has been spent in giving public money to private individuals. Then there was the allegation that the Transvaal was governed by an oligarchy. Are not we in this country similarly governed? Is not the real power vested in the House of Lords? If we are justified in attacking a corrupt oligarchy in South Africa, then I hope the time is not far distant when hon. Members will join in attacking the corrupt oligarchy which prevails in this country. But remember that the Boers were attached to all these abuses just as hon. Members opposite are attached to similar abuses in this country. I venture to assert, however, that if a foreign army were to come to this country with the avowed intention of sweeping away the House of Lords, Radicals, Democrats, and Socialists would promptly join in resisting them to the death, however much they may dislike the House of Lords, because we all have an innate love of the freedom of nations. Nations all like to be governed by themselves, and it is that love of freedom which has enabled the Boers to resist for so long the overwhelming forces we have launched against them. 220,000 of our men have been kept at bay by not more than 70,000 Boers. If military glory is anything more than hypocrisy, than a delusion and a snare, then I think that glory is with the men who have been fighting against us. It has been a case of the weak against the strong, of the oppressed against the oppressor, and of the freeman against the tyrant. Before the war broke out we were told that its object was to defend our colonies, and that it was produced by the ultimatum delivered by the Boers. I believe the real ultimatum was that of the right hon. Gentleman the Colonial Secretary, which was sent several days before President Kruger handed in his. Is this a war of defence, or is it to be one of extermination? How have we been speaking and writing about our enemies? A correspondent of the *Morning Post* not very long since wrote of the joy he had experienced in seeing the smoke of a rebel's burning house, and he spoke of the Boers as vermin. That is the way in which certain portions of the press are in the habit of talking about the Boers, and yet I find in the *Daily News* a very different character given to these men. The writer desired to place it on record that, in his opinion, the Boer farmer is clean in his home life, that his domestic arrangements are pure, and that he compares very favourably with the farming classes in Australia, America, and Great Britain. How is it that Englishmen are acting so contrary to all their previous instincts and habits, and are rejoicing in the attempts to deprive these people of their independence? The only doctrine held by the people of this country which would enable this war to go on is that they believe their country must be backed up whether it is right or wrong. That is the opinion held by the man in the street, the man in the pulpit, the man in the newspaper office, and the man in the House of Commons, but the doctrine is as false as false can be, and it strikes at the root of all national religion, honour, truth, and morality. What is this doctrine of "Our country, right or wrong," leading to in South Africa at the present moment? It is leading to the crushing out of two independent Republics. What are the two Republics? One was the Orange Free State; but you have blotted out the "free" now. An impartial observer, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen, long before this war broke out, said that the government of the Orange Free State was about the very best as regarded freedom and comfort the world had ever seen. You are fighting at this moment to prevent that government being carried on. Such a policy is the policy of the freebooter, the filibuster, the burglar, and the Boxer. Everything is on the debit side; there is nothing at all to our credit. What have we lost? We have lost boundless treasure; we have lost countless men and noble lives; we have

lost our prestige and our position in the world. ["Oh!"] That is why you cannot send anybody to China. We have lost our character. Never again can England pose as the friend of freedom, the protector of the weak, the guardian of the oppressed. She has fallen from her high estate, and thinks now of nothing but supremacy, and paramountcy, and Empire. We shall be told that this is a vote of censure upon the Colonial Secretary; that, at least, is my object, because no man has done so much to bring about this state of things as the Colonial Secretary. He stands head and shoulders above his colleagues—or, shall I say, his accomplices—in the efforts which have been made to support and carry on this odious and un-English policy. But I should like to make use of his own words of four years ago in condemning this very policy. They are words well known to the House; but in every debate upon South Africa they out to be read, and also at every public meeting and in every discussion, hackneyed though they may be—

"A war in South Africa would be one of the most serious wars that could possibly be waged. It would be in the nature of a civil war. It would be a long war, a bitter war, and a costly war, and, as I have pointed out already, it would leave behind it the embers of a strife which I believe generations would not be long enough to extinguish. To go to war with President Kruger in order to force upon him reforms in the internal affairs of his State, in which Secretaries of State have repudiated all right of interference, that would be a course of action as immoral as it would be unwise." *

That is the course of action the Colonial Secretary has now taken, and by taking it he has brought discredit, degradation, demoralisation and, probably, disaster upon his country. For that reason I say he deserves the censure of every friend of humanity, peace, and justice. I beg to move a reduction of the Vote by £100.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item A (Salaries) be reduced by £100, in respect of the Salary of the Secretary of State."—(*Sir Wilfrid Lawson.*)

MR. ARTHUR ELLIOT (Durham) said the hon. Baronet had spoken in what he thought were the interests of peace, but there was nothing in the speech which would enable the country to take a better position or to come to sounder conclusions than were to be found in the Blue-books, nor were there in it any suggestions likely to be helpful in the present difficulties. In the speech of the late Under Secretary for the Colonies there were some things with which he agreed and others with which he disagreed. The hon. Member seemed to argue that it was impossible to think of the future, but that was just what the House ought to think of. He had read the Blue-books, and to his mind there never was more painful reading. Neither side seemed to have the slightest power to enter into the difficulties and prepossessions of the other. That was a difficult task, but it was the task the Imperial Government and the country had to undertake. They had to look at both sides, and avoid not only the fact, but even the appearance of being led away by local faction. It was the duty of the Government to see that justice was carried through, and that men did not suffer for having been true to the flag. This was almost the last debate of the present session, and very likely the last debate on the subject of South Africa in the present Parliament. Before Parliament reassembled the constituencies, north, south, east, and west, would have been addressed, and it was important that they should consider the spirit which should animate the policy to be adopted. Members of Parliament were somewhat like a flock of sheep, and the speech of the Colonial Secretary that day would be all important because, in all probability, it would indicate the line of policy to which the great majority of this House of Commons, when it revisited the constituencies, would address themselves; and he said without hesitation that any candidate who thought when he addressed the electorate that he would gain popularity by exciting animosity against the enemies who had been fighting against us, or by beating the big war drum, would be acting a part hostile to the highest interest of the country. He looked with confidence to the Colonial Secretary and the Government to indicate, as they had indicated by some of their despatches, that they were not actuated by vindictive motives, and that they would in anything they said — which would really be addressed to the country—accentuate that line and show they were true to the policy which they had professed to hold

* 8th May, 1896. (See *The Parliamentary Debates* [Fourth Series], Vol. xl., page 914.)

all through of working steadily, unforgetfully, and persistently to build up in South Africa a free and self-governing community. That, after all, was the great object for which they should work, and then Unionist Members who supported them could go to the country feeling they were supporting a noble policy. As to the Blue-books, there were two points as to which vehement discussion took place between one side or the other—the questions of annexation and the treatment of the rebels. Both were open to differences of opinion on the part of honourable and patriotic men, and to say that those who opposed annexation were the enemies of their country was to talk nonsense. He did not condemn gentlemen who took that view as unpatriotic and untrue citizens, but he did say that those who argued in favour of setting up again two independent or quasi-independent nationalities in South Africa were shutting their eyes to facts. All such ideas must be abandoned; the system had been tried and it had failed. He did not hesitate to say he would have been more patient and have given it a longer trial, but it was gone, and gone for ever. In his opinion the only chance South Africa now had of good, free, and progressive government was in a combination under the British flag, but that again was a question on which men differed and might differ as patriotic men. With regard to how rebels should be treated, he supposed everybody agreed that those who had borne arms against the Crown must be punished. On this point there did not appear to be much ifference between the two parties in Cape Colony. Both sides had come to the conclusion that it was absolutely necessary, in proceeding against the rebels, to depart from the procedure of the ordinary law. That might be a wise conclusion, but it was undoubtedly an uncommonly strong one. He should like to point out that in the rebellions of 1715, 1745, and 1780 they had never tried persons otherwise than by the ordinary law—trial by jury.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): Judge Jeffreys.

*MR. ARTHUR ELLIOT said he was taking the troubles in this country onwards from the Revolution, and Judge Jeffreys was before the period he referred to.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN said surely the hon. Member did not advise them to follow such a precedent in this case. He knew what was the justice that was meted out to the rebels on the occasions of which he spoke. Surely he did not suggest that they should mete out similar treatment to the rebels in this case.

*MR. ARTHUR ELLIOT said he certainly did not. His argument was that both sides, as represented by the arguments in the Blue-books, had come to a very strong but also to a right conclusion, but he desired to point out that even the Dutch in South Africa were willing to go lengths which the Government of this country had not gone in the case of the rebellions referred to. He thought in that they were proceeding on the only lines on which some sort of reasonable justice could be meted out. Before he left the subject of the war he desired to refer, for the sake of obtaining an explanation, to Lord Roberts's despatch of 1st June, containing his proclamation warning the inhabitants of the Orange River Colony that after fourteen days those who were found in arms would be liable to be dealt with as rebels. He would like to have a legal explanation as to how it was that one of the belligerents could turn armed enemies in the field, by issuing a proclamation, into rebels. Supposing a war broke out between France and England, and the island of Jersey fell into the hands of the French, would it be maintained that by issuing a proclamation annexing the British territory the French, in consequence of the proclamation, turned those who had been enemies into rebels? He could not understand how, in accordance with the ordinary usages of warfare and the ordinary doctrines of international law, the terms of Lord Roberts's proclamation could be justified. The Committee had not on this occasion to deal with the policy before the war; they had to look ahead. He was glad to think that, before very long, peace would be established. Then would come their difficulties and trials. Whatever Government was in power would be faced with those difficulties, but hon. Members had not indicated in any degree how they should be met. To think that without any exceptional

coercive and punitive means everything would come right was to blind themselves to existing facts. He did not see how they could get a very much better Minister than the Colonial Secretary to introduce and give effect to the working of a system of local government in South Africa. There was nothing in the right hon. Gentleman's career to show that he set less value than the rest of them on local institutions. As to Sir Alfred Milner, he did not know whether he would be the Minister who was to restore peace and build up a system of local government in South Africa, but Sir Alfred Milner would be the first to recognise that the energies and qualities and abilities necessary to conduct a great war to a successful issue were of a different kind from those qualities required to build up a peaceful system of government among jarring nations. Without tact, judgment, and the exercise of very considerable patience, what was the result they should bring themselves to? He did not think there was any harm in mentioning it, for everyone must know that the result would be the suspension of constitutional government in Cape Colony. That was a disaster which he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would keep them clear of, and he trusted that he would lead them to the building up of free constitutional government throughout South Africa.

SIR ROBERT REID (Dumfries Burghs): I believe that if the spirit which has characterised the speech of my hon. friend who has just spoken had been more apparent in the House and in the country during the last twelve months, this wretched war might have been averted, or, at all events, the difficulties in which we now find ourselves would have been considerably reduced. As a matter of fact, I do not think anyone who remembers the reckless methods which have been adopted, and almost countenanced by those in high authority, in regard to public meeting and free speech throughout the country, can say that they have been conceived in the spirit of the speech of the hon. Member. But I am glad to believe that there is now obtaining a more sober view in regard to this public calamity and the intense danger of the situation in which we have been placed than was the case a few months ago. I can assure the House I shall endeavour to do nothing to diminish that sobriety. This is the first opportunity we have had for some time of considering the policy which has landed us in our present position, and it is the last opportunity we shall have during this present session of Parliament, and it may be during this Parliament. It is therefore our duty, without bitterness and, at all events, with frankness, fearlessly to consider the position in which we find ourselves, and to criticise the policy which has led to it, with a view, if possible, of diminishing the dangers which are to come. It is said that it is useless to criticise, and in some sense that is true. If we ask questions I do not think the answers are always very full. When we wished to raise a discussion on the proper terms of settlement before they had been concluded by the absolute declarations of the Government and the actual annexation of the Orange Free State, we were prevented by a blocking notice which the Government did not think it proper to take steps to remove. If we blame the policy of the Government, we have until recently been told what is absolutely untrue — that we are the enemies of the country, or that we are animated by some personal spirit towards the Colonial Secretary, which also is untrue. If any Members on this side of the House venture to agree with the Government, their position is still more unfortunate, because I find that Lord James of Hereford, the other day, spoke of my hon. friends in terms which I will read to the Committee. He said—

> "Who are the Liberal Imperialists, and what do they mean? They come as candidates before the constituencies, and they say, 'We are Liberals, and we support the policy of Her Majesty's Government in relation to that question which in the coming election must be the only question before the people of this country.' I object to Unionist candidates being opposed by men who have nothing to say but that they think the Government is right in what they are doing. I want to have the fight fairly fought. Unionists do not want to see the white flag hoisted, and then to be fired at from under its protection."

I am not one of those Liberal Imperialists; I have a very imperfect conception of what Liberal Imperialism means. But I must say that it is a very curious political situation, in which the chief offence which can be perpetrated from this side of the House against a Government is to express a sincere belief in the wisdom of the policy of the Government. I regret, with all goodwill and perfect frankness,

the differences on this side of the House; they have gone far to paralyse the usefulness of the Liberal party and of the Opposition. I regret the position most deeply; I hope it will be of short duration; but I am perfectly certain that the misfortune will not be diminished or the period of its duration shortened by maintaining silence in regard to the opinions we hold. The hon. Gentleman opposite said we ought to look at the actual facts and circumstances. I will look at them, and I shall confine myself to looking at them simply from the point of view of the interests of our own country and of the British Empire. If any questions of ethics obtrude themselves, let the Government settle them with their own party. The war has now lasted for nine or ten months; we have occupied the capital of both the enemies' States; we have established beyond question the military supremacy of this country. If anybody doubted—as it was said the Boers doubted, although we always knew better—the courage of the British soldiers, that doubt has been removed by the uncomplaining courage of our troops—a courage which has never been surpassed in the annals of the world. What are the losses? What is the present diminution of the effective force in South Africa? In killed, captured, and those invalided home, I believe the total amounts to 35,000 men.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): Oh, more than that!

SIR ROBERT REID: You have to add to that number those who are at present in hospital in South Africa. I do not know what that number is, but I believe it is something like 20,000. That is to say we have sustained a diminution of our effective force after nine months fighting equal to 55,000 men. There is no man in this House who does not feel the deepest sympathy with the men who have exposed themselves and suffered as these men and the bereaved relations have done. And what has been the cost of this policy? Including the temporary force for home defence, I make it that the cost amounts to something like £60,000,000, and I am afraid we cannot absolutely say the war is yet over. It is uncertain how long it may last. I hope most heartily that the enemy will soon desist from an unequal struggle which can lead to nothing but further bloodshed and further misery. We cannot, however, yet pronounce the war ended; I wish we could. There is another accomplished fact which deserves attention. There has been an intense bitterness created in the Cape Colony and Natal—a reign of hatred and suspicion between the two races. There are complaints, to which my hon. friend alluded—complaints of the abuse of martial law. I cannot enter upon that matter; I have no materials for the purpose. I am not prepared to accept newspaper statements as sufficient ground for making so grave an indictment. But this I say: while martial law during time of war and in the areas occupied by the fighting forces is often and probably in this case necessary, there is nothing more liable to abuse, and there are some precepts which ought to be observed with the greatest possible care. There never ought to be a refusal to allow legal advice to be taken; there never ought to be detention for an undue space of time before trial; there never ought to be—in law there never can be—in regard to civil offences a martial court sitting alongside a civil court. From the moment the civil power is able to re-assert itself martial law in regard to civil offences becomes unlawful and is one of the gravest crimes that can be perpetrated. There has been complaint of that, but that is for the Cape Parliament primarily to inquire into; the responsibility is theirs, and they have the means for active inquiry which we have not. But the fact remains that a population which has hitherto been living in perfect harmony, whatever their ulterior designs may have been—about which much that is foolish has been said—are now divided into hostile camps corresponding with racial differences—a most grave and dangerous condition of things. Let me look for a moment at the future. Soon, I trust, peace will be re-established. I am afraid it will be re-established only by such a destruction of life among the adult population of the Orange Free State and the Transvaal as will make further military resistance impossible, but it will be restored, I hope, soon, and then will begin the duty of the Government of governing those countries in the name of the Queen. Let me look first at the conquered territory. To govern that country will be an experience absolutely unique in

the history of this nation, and, I believe, in the history of the world. The two colonies taken together comprise a country nearly the size of France, 6,000 miles away from you by sea, and many hundreds of miles inland. The population, whose extraordinary bravery and military capacity no one can deny, is a white population, a population kindred to ourselves, with a degree of kinship with which only the curious are really acquainted. The British population is insignificant except near Johannesburg. I assume that disarmament will of necessity follow—so far as we can effect disarmament. It cannot be wholly effected, because the native population very greatly outnumbers the white. It is not a very easy task to disarm a population occupying a territory the size of France, very far away from our immediate control, with the enormous border the country has, and a very scant white population. For some time, no doubt, the Boers will be so stunned by the terrific blow that has been levelled against them that they will be quiescent and unable to take any active hostile part. That may be so, but there is too much reason to fear, from the lessons of history, from the history of the Dutch race itself, that they will not long acquiesce in their conquest. A great army must be maintained there, with long lines of communication through existing colonies which are by no means likely to acquiesce in the subjugation of their fellow-countrymen. We know what guerilla warfare means, and how dangerous it is in a difficult country a long way from your base. How many troops will be needed in the two conquered Republics for the purpose of maintaining the authority of the Crown, and how long will they be required? If it is the opinion of the Colonial Secretary, as quoted from his speech by the hon. Baronet the Member for Cockermouth, that the feeling of hostility which would be created by a war with South Africa will last for generations, what is the prospect for us? We have a vast Empire which it is supposed we care for; the love of this Empire is supposed to be confined entirely to the hon. Gentlemen opposite with whom we have the misfortune temporarily to differ. What is the prospect for anyone who takes a pride in the Empire? What is our position in China, and what are our duties all over the world? Is it possible that this should be overlooked by anyone who seriously approaches the problem? This great military force which will be required at the Cape will have to be maintained at the cost of the people of this country. We cannot place the charge on Cape Colony or Natal, and if we want to get money from the Transvaal it will have to be from the mines and the minerals, and you will find that you will not get more than enough, if enough, to pay the interest on some part of the loans you have raised for the purposes of this war. What is the prospect, too, in Cape Colony itself? The population there is, at all events, four to three, perhaps three to two, Dutch as against British, and you have only to read Sir Alfred Milner's own despatches to see that they have the keenest sympathy with the Boers, and the keenest desire that you shall not extirpate the last vestige of a nation in which they take so great an interest. Disfranchisement is threatened. The Colonial Secretary threatened it in his despatch as a penal necessity. Personally I do not at all think that disfranchisement for a period of five years, for example, having regard to what the old laws of treason were, is a punishment of very undue severity; but looked at from the point of view of the hon. Member for Poplar it will be a method of disturbing the constitutional balance of that country. Is it likely to affect the balance? Ten thousand is stated by Sir A. Milner as being the number which will be affected by this abolition of the franchise. I do not know if they are all voters, but even if they are, it is a very small method of trying to affect the constitutional balance of the country, and it cannot be effective because the effect will only be short. But we have to consider more than that; we have also to consider the possibility indicated by the hon. Member for Durham—the possibility of being called upon to suppress the Constitution of Cape Colony. We were much relieved by the observations of Lord James of Hereford, who has been kind enough to speak plainly on this subject. After formulating the principle which he thought ought to prevail, he proceeded to say that, if it were necessary to enforce this simple plan, even though the Constitution were suspended, he believed there would be a strong note of disapprobation not only in this country, but in every colony enjoying free government. If any such

necessity arises it will be the most complete and decisive condemnation that could be conceived of the policy which has been pursued towards South Africa. The secret of the unity of the British Empire is that we do not attempt to govern our white fellow-subjects. No one has described more eloquently that feature of the British Empire than the Colonial Secretary upon the Australian Commonwealth Bill. But if we were to violate that essential condition of our Empire in South Africa, must not everyone feel that, quite apart from the question of South Africa, the most gloomy forebodings might be raised among other colonies as to the tenure of their freedom resting upon a precarious basis? If the Government are going to suspend the Constitution in Cape Colony they will find that there will be opened a bottomless pit into which they will have to throw the blood and treasure of the people of this country, which it is the primary duty of the Government to protect. These are the dangers of this policy, the results of which are visible to all men's minds. They cannot much longer be concealed by complacent newspapers. There is one chance only, and that is that under an absolutely just and beneficent Government the angry and rankling feelings created in South Africa by the war may gradually subside and be replaced by peace and progress. Those who favour the Government hope that the nationality of the Boers will be merged in a South African nationality, and that the devotion they have shown to their own flag may be transferred to us. I most earnestly hope that that consummation may arise. But I wish I could share the belief that it is likely to arise. Of this I am perfectly certain—every harsh exercise of the power of martial law will retard it; every sneering attempt to fix disaffection upon the whole of the Dutch race will retard it. The only chance of that consummation must rest upon the conviction of the Dutch community that the privileges and rights of the English in the colonies will be extended on an equal footing to the Dutch also, provided they do not transgress the law. The situation in South Africa has been created by the policy of Her Majesty's Government. I am not going to trouble the House by going over the ground again, which has already been traversed. The situation has been created by the policy of the Government, and it is on that ground that I am going to vote for the Amendment of my hon. friend. I have always held that the Boer ultimatum and invasion of the British territory were wholly indefensible. But these were the outcome of the menacing and harassing course pursued by the Government, and principally by the Colonial Secretary. The evil can only be cured by the healing virtue of moderation and forbearance; and I trust that the Colonial Secretary, who is a man of extraordinary intellectual powers, will show in his treatment of the situation that he possesses these qualities.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The hon. and learned Gentleman who has just sat down fulfilled the promise of his opening remarks by the propriety and sobriety of his language and the sweet reasonableness of his arguments, and it may be convenient that at this stage I should say a few words—they will not be many—in reply to what he has advanced. I confess that I looked forward to this debate with great interest and great eagerness. I regretted that it was necessarily postponed by the greater urgency of other matters which have had days of Supply devoted to them. I was anxious for this debate, because I desired in this great controversy to secure a clear issue. There is room, no doubt, for differences of opinion, even for extreme differences of conscientious opinion, and if once differences exist there is only one tribunal we can appeal to to settle them. But in order that that tribunal may settle them, and settle them satisfactorily, it must be in possession of the whole case. It must be in the possession, therefore, not merely of the views of the Government, which I think have been fully and frankly expressed, and which I am prepared to repeat, but it must also be in the possession of the views of the Opposition. To this debate, then, I have looked in order that we may gather for the information of the country the views of the Opposition upon this matter, so that when the time comes we may obtain a fair decision upon it. An Amendment has been moved by the hon. Baronet the Member for the Cockermouth Division to reduce the salary of the Secretary of State. The hon. Baronet has himself explained to the House the sense in which he understands the vote on his Amendment will be taken. If there be other

matters upon which it is desired to censure the Secretary of State, it is possible, of course, to move reductions in the Vote upon which those other questions can be raised. But it cannot lie in the mouth of those who vote for this Amendment to say, "I did not vote because I am opposed to the war. On the contrary, I am a Liberal Imperialist. I only voted because I think the Colonial Secretary did not act discreetly with respect to the complaints of some official in Ceylon or Barbados." That will not do. I do not conceive for a moment it would suggest itself to the minds of any hon. Gentlemen opposite that they should adopt such a course as that.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): Then why suggest it?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Very good. So far we are entirely agreed. Then, what is the issue upon which we are going to take a vote? Let me say that I think also those who refrain from voting will find themselves in a difficult position. They will have something to explain. After all, this is, as the hon. and learned gentleman said, a most serious discussion. We are engaged in the greatest war of our generation. The cost of life and treasure has been tremendous. The whole question, then, of the policy of the war, of the continuance of the war, and of the results of the war —all that is the greatest question which this House has had to consider. And upon that there can be no neutral ground. There must be a vote on one side or on the other. Nothing could be more contemptible in politics than that in such a case as this, where the existence, the security, and the honour of the nation are at stake, anyone present in the House should run out of it on the division.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: We are all agreed in that.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: So far, then, we are agreed. We shall get the issue which I have no doubt both of us desire. The issue raised by the hon. Baronet the Member for the Cockermouth Division is that the whole policy of the war is wrong; that the war is wrong, and as a consequence—the only logical and necessary consequence—that the annexation of the two Republics is wrong, and that their independence ought to be restored. That, also, is the view frankly expressed by the hon. and learned Gentleman who has just sat down. In fact, I can conceive of no other that can be taken by any man who honestly and conscientiously believes that this war is an unjust and an unrighteous war. To say that the war is unjust and unrighteous, and then to vote for punishing the innocent and giving something to the guilty—allowing the guilty to profit by their guiltiness—that is a most illogical and immoral doctrine, and on that issue we are very glad to challenge the judgment of the House. What is the position taken by the hon. and learned Gentleman? He laid a great deal of stress on, and spoke with much feeling of, the misery which has been caused by this war—the loss of life and money, and so forth. But surely the hon. and learned Gentleman must know as well as everyone else that all that is absolutely irrelevant. It is an appeal to sentiment which has nothing to do with the issue we are trying. Of course it may be an argument against all war.

SIR ROBERT REID: Really, it is a new method of controversy that the right hon. Gentleman is adopting—— [Cheers, and, as Mr. Chamberlain refused to give way, loud Ministerial cries of "Order, order!"] I wish to correct a statement of the right hon. Gentleman, but, of course, if he will not allow me to do so I will sit down.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: If the hon. and learned Gentleman has any correction to make I will give way at once. But he was making a new argument.

SIR ROBERT REID: I have a correction to make. My reason for voting for the reduction is that I believe that his policy has been disastrous to his country.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I have no doubt. That was also the statement of the hon. Baronet as well as of the hon. and learned Member who followed him. But that is not a correction. That is what I have been pressing upon the Committee from the beginning as the issue. I have also incidentally defined what that policy is to which the hon. and learned Gentleman is entirely opposed. But the hon. and learned Gentleman's interruption refers to an earlier part of my speech.

What I was saying at the moment was that all these statements made by him or by anyone else with regard to the terrible fruits of war are not relevant to the question whether the war is just and righteous or not. Assume that we were all agreed that it was just and righteous—still it would be equally true to say that there would have been great loss of life and all these terrible results which the hon. Gentleman puts before us in such moving language. It is irrelevant language. You must not judge the war by the loss of life and limb incurred, but by other considerations altogether. The greatest war of our times—a war in which thousands lost their lives where in this war only units have done so—the great Civil War of America, even Mr. Bright defended as a just and righteous war. Yet the loss and suffering caused by it was infinite in comparison with that of the present war. But the hon. and learned Gentleman went on to say that as a result of this war—which, I suppose, we ought to have taken into account when the policy which led to the war was entered upon—there has been a creation of race hatred in South Africa which it will take generations to cure. We can claim that we were not unaware of that. The very paragraph which has been quoted, and with which substantially I entirely agree, shows that we were fully aware that if we did enter into this war it would be a great calamity, and, therefore, we had every reason to avoid it. Our contention, which is part of the issue on which the Committee will vote, and which the hon. and learned Gentleman honestly and conscientiously disputes, is that we could not avoid the war, that the war was inevitable as well as just, and that we have to take these consequences, terrible as they are, as a result of a war which we believe to be just. I must, however, be permitted to say that the hon. and learned Gentleman takes no account of history at all when he talks of the creation of race feeling. It would be very difficult to fix the exact time at which that race feeling began to develop itself. The one thing we can say is that its appearance was synchronous with the activity of the Afrikander Bond. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Poplar spoke in rather large terms of the necessity of doing justice to the loyalty of the Dutch, of a recognition of the loyal position taken up by the leaders of the Afrikander Bond, and of the necessity of consulting them in regard to any future settlement. Sir, let us understand one another. I observe that hon. Gentlemen opposite very often talk of the Dutch as though the race difference were a race difference alone. It is not so. There are Dutchmen and Dutchmen. There are the Dutch who have been disloyal, and the Dutch who, with every difficulty in their way, incurring thereby the hatred and persecution of many of their own people, bravely stood up for us. They have been loyal to the flag which protects them, and recognise the advantages which they enjoyed under the British Crown. Why did not the hon. Member make that distinction clear? Which of the Dutch is it that we are to consult? What section of the Dutch is it? That which has been loyal?

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: If the right hon. Gentleman asks me, I will tell him. What I said is that the Afrikander Bond as a whole, leaders and members, had, in spite of enormous difficulties, remained loyal and had not taken part in this rebellion.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: On what authority does the hon. Gentleman make that statement? What justification has he for standing the guarantor of the loyalty of the leaders of the Afrikander Bond? I want the Committee to remember that this debate is addressed to two audiences. It is addressed to England, where any vagaries of the hon. Gentleman will be estimated at their true value. But what is to be the effect of such a statement as that in South Africa at the present time, where you have one of the leaders of the Bond, a late Minister of Her Majesty's Government, Mr. Te Water, addressing a meeting of the Bond and saying that the only fault of the Ministry was that they had allowed the Cape Colony of Her Majesty to be used by British soldiers? Is that the opinion that the hon. Gentleman thinks it would have been right and wise for us to consult? What word has he used in the whole of his speech to recognise the loyalty of those other Dutchmen and of that vast majority of British colonists who, as I say, have held to the British Crown and flag in circumstances of the greatest difficulty? Not a word of recognition. Not one atom of sympathy for

their sufferings. The hon. Gentleman palliates rebellion. He condones rebellion. He thinks that five years disfranchisement is an excessive punishment for a rebel, for a man who, having absolutely no grievance of any kind, but enjoying the utmost liberty and freedom, has taken up arms against Her Majesty, shot her soldiers, and looted the property and outraged the persons of Her Majesty's loyal subjects.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: I do not like to interrupt the right hon. Gentleman, but I did refer to the loyal colonists. I spoke of them as deserving well of their country. I said it more than once. I distinguished between them and the rebels, and I said I was not arguing that five years disfranchisment was too great a sentence. I was referring to the right hon. Gentleman's proposal of a life-long disfranchisement. I did not refer to it in regard to its leniency; but I said that at the present time that form of punishment was the worst that could be chosen.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I do not remember the observation of the hon. Gentleman; what I do remember was that he said that Mr. Schreiner deserved well of the country, but I do not remember he said a single word in favour of any of the——

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: I did.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Then of course I accept his statement. Now I come to the point which the hon. Gentleman has just referred to. He occupied, I suppose, twenty minutes in denouncing a proposal for lifelong disfranchisement, which was only put forward by me in answer to a request from the Cape Government to state what might, in my opinion, be what would be right and proper. It was not pressed, as the hon. Gentleman says. It has been abandoned in favour of the still more moderate and still more lenient proposal for five years disfranchisement, which was not made by me but which was made by the Attorney General of the Cape Government before they knew what my opinions were, and which has been adopted by the present Cape Ministers.

MR. COURTNEY (Cornwall, Bodmin): Has the abandonment of the life-long disfranchisement your approval?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: No abandonment was necessary. I had no right to dictate to the Cape Government, and I never attempted to. They asked me for suggestions, and I made my suggestions; and let me say now with regard to those suggestions that I think they were the most lenient, the most moderate, the most reasonable that could possibly have been administered. Personally, I still consider that it would have been very much better that the penalty for the class of rebels who are under consideration should have been life-long disfranchisement, of course leaving it open to Her Majesty's Government or to the Cape Government at any time to re-enfranchise the men if they found the circumstances would justify it. A life-long disfranchisement is considered to be a considerable punishment—an excessive punishment the hon. Gentleman called it. I wonder whether he knows what the Cape law is. The Cape law is that a man who is convicted for treason may be sentenced to death, may be imprisoned for life or any shorter term, may be fined to the full extent of his fortune, but he must be disfranchised for life. My hon. friend the Member for Durham spoke about an extraordinary proceeding we were lending our support to for establishing a Special Commission. He quoted cases in which rebels had been tried by the ordinary law of the land. Interrupting him I inquired whether my hon. friend wanted to press upon the Government the adoption of the plan adopted in 1715 and 1745.

*MR. ARTHUR ELLIOT said that he approved altogether of the substitution of a special Commission for trial by jury.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: What I was going to say was that the Special Commission was the proposal of the late Cape Ministers, and was assented to by the gentlemen who afterwards resigned from the Ministry on the point of disfranchisement. To have had all the men, perhaps thousands in number, tried by jury would have been impracticable; certainly it would not have conduced to a just verdict in all cases. Considering the heat and feeling which undoubtedly pre-

vailed I think it might have been possible to predict what the verdict would be, and I think the Cape Government took a proper course in deciding to have a special tribunal. Then there is no difference of opinion either between the late Cape Government or the dissentient Ministers and Her Majesty's Government as to the treatment of the ringleaders. I imagine that as to persons who have committed acts contrary to the usages of war, or who have otherwise behaved in an exceptionally bad manner, it is agreed by all that they must be brought to trial by the Special Commission. Then there remain those who have either been willing to join the rebels, or who have been able to show that they joined under compulsion. The hon. Member for Poplar assured the Committee that very few have willingly joined. I take exception altogether to that statement.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: What I said was that Sir Alfred Milner's despatch showed that very few had willingly or gratuitously joined.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I entirely misunderstood the hon. Member. But I differ from the hon. Member still with regard to the inference he draws from Sir Alfred Milner's despatch. As certain as anything can possibly be, what happened was this — the Cape Colonists who sympathised with the rebels, sent word to the rebels inviting them to come, and promised that if they came in they would rise and join. They wanted an excuse—an appearance of compulsion at any rate—but the despatches which we have been able to obtain, the despatches from the Boer officers themselves, show that when they came in they were heartily welcomed. They had no difficulty whatever in commandeering those who afterwards joined. After the Boers had commandeered the willing colonists they dealt with the loyal colonists. In most cases they gave them eight days notice to quit—sometimes less —unless they would join them and fight against their own flag and their own country. That was the treatment which was meted out to loyalists, and now the assumption is, according to the arguments of hon. Gentlemen opposite, that we are to take no account whatever of that—that the men who have so behaved, who have willingly rebelled against the flag, are to come back, are to find their farms preserved for them, in many cases by British soldiers, and are to be able, if they so please, to taunt those who were loyal with the loss of their property and the injury to themselves and their families. I say that is an intolerable state of things. But, as I have explained in one of my despatches, the policy of Her Majesty's Government is not a vindictive policy. Revenge does not enter into our minds, nor, as I believe, does it enter into the minds of any reasonable people in this country. What we want is prevention. We do not want rebellion to be made so easy and so profitable that if any difficulty at any future time recurs, the same men may again go out in arms against us. What do we propose in the case of the men who have behaved as I have described? We do not propose to submit them to the death penalty or to imprison them; we do not propose to even fine them, but we propose to disarm them politically for five years. This is the whole punishment. It was said we should disarm them as far as possible. Is it not illogical to say you are to take away the rifles which these people have used for certain purposes injurious to the British Empire, and that you are going to give them votes in order to do the same thing by other means? I will not attempt to quote the words of the hon. Member for Poplar, but the whole implication of his speech was that a punishment was being imposed for the rebellion which ought not to be imposed.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: I did not say that five years disfranchisement was an excessive punishment, but I said that, under the present circumstances of the Cape, disfranchisement was the worst and most inexpedient form of punishment that could be imposed.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I have just found what I put down while the hon. Member was speaking. He said disfranchisement is the worst method, taken in the worst place and at the worst time. Then he says he did not object to that punishment. That was the whole argument of the hon. Gentleman. One reason, he says, why we should not have done this is that it raises suspicion about the Colonial Secretary. I am quite aware there are many suspicions about the Colonial Secretary. Whom have I to

thank for that? The suspicions are all derived from the speeches of hon. Gentlemen opposite; they are not derived from fact. They are not derived in the least from fact, they are not derived from anything I have said, from anything I have written, from anything I have done, but they are derived from ignoble motives which hon. Gentlemen have imputed to me, from articles in the press, from Conciliation Committees, and Stop-the-war Committees, and from their literature, which I do not read, but which I see when it comes back to me from South Africa as having been quoted and repeated by some of the leaders, I will not say of the rebellion, but I will say some of those who are hostile to the British position in South Africa. Yes, I know what the suspicions amount to, and I do not hesitate to say what was the object of hon. Gentlemen. They have undoubtedly seriously embarrassed from the beginning to the end the very hard and difficult work in which I have been engaged. At the same time I have taken one course, I have spoken plainly, I have endeavoured to say exactly what I mean, so that no one could misunderstand me, and I believe, in the long run at any rate, that that will prove to have been the best course. I think I have really dealt with most of what has been said. I would, however, refer to one expression of the hon. Baronet the Member for Cockermouth, or of the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite, who complained that people called him and his friends the enemies of their country. Well, Sir, I really do not know of any one who has made any such charge against either the hon. and learned Gentleman or the hon. Baronet the Member for Cockermouth. But, when the hon. Baronet the Member for Cockermouth says of his countrymen that they are "freebooters," "burglars," and "Boxers," it is very difficult indeed to represent him as a friend of his country. The hon. and learned Gentleman opposite, although I do not think he defined his position very clearly, as I understand is against the annexation of the two Republics. If so, will he bear this in mind, that in the first place he is opposing himself to the unanimous opinion of all the great self-governing colonies who have assisted us in this matter. That is one point on which through all their Governments they had officially communicated their opinion before we came to a decision. He is going against the opinion of every loyal Englishmen and Dutchman in Natal and in the Cape Colony. He is going against the opinion, I believe, of nine out of ten of his own countrymen. It is true the hon. Baronet says the country has gone mad. Well, we know that frame of mind; there are a good number of people who hold that opinion, that all the rest of the world is mad, but then they are generally shut up. But, although hon. Gentlemen are perfectly at liberty to hold their opinion, and to press it upon the House, I do ask the Committee to consider what would be the result of adopting it. What would be the position then of these loyal colonists, whose desires you would have rejected? Might you not then be accused of having "flouted" them? You would be doing that, and at the same time you would be doing worse than that, you would be discouraging all your loyal subjects in South Africa. The hon. and learned Gentleman in the concluding words of his speech reverted to the *rôle* of prophet, which is always a favourite one on occasions like this. It is so easy to prophesy, and it is so impossible to say whether or not the prophecy will come true, and when the prophecy has been proved to be untrue then all the interest in the matter has disappeared. He might quote me in the same sense, because in the speech to which the hon. Baronet the Member for Cockermouth referred I did no doubt say, four years ago, that a war in South Africa would create feeling which might take generations to allay. Well, that was a prophecy. I should like to say now that, with greater knowledge, I am more hopeful. I do not conceal from myself the terrible divisions among families, among peoples, among races, among religions, which exist at the present time in South Africa. But it seems to me that those who know most of the country are of opinion that hitherto those divisions have been based upon a misunderstanding on the part of the Boers of the English character and the English power, and that now that that misunderstanding has been removed by the war the probability is that after a short time they will settle down to a condition of things in which certainly they will not have anything to complain of. We have publicly declared it to be our desire and intention to give to them at

the earliest possible moment self-government similar to that enjoyed by our own colonies. When hon. Members in this debate have spoken of disfranchisement and other punishments, and have said that, while the object of the war was to enfranchise the Uitlanders, the result of the war would be to disfranchise the Boers, they ignore the fact, which they know perfectly well, that while for a period, which I hope may be brief, it is absolutely necessary that the country should be governed with large military forces present in it, yet we regard that as only a temporary situation, and one which we hope will be altered at the earliest possible moment. I have been asked by my hon. friend to say something about the future. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Poplar urged delay. Well, I think delay has been a colonial policy for too many years. I do not entirely agree with the hon. Gentleman. No doubt we must not proceed too hastily, and we shall have to proceed step by step. But there are some things which are very clear. The first thing is the announcement which has been made that the two States will be annexed to Her Majesty's dominions and no political independence will be reserved to them in the future. Let me say that if you want authority for that you will find it in the writings and speeches of one of those men to whom all appeal in South Africa as a representative of judicial impartiality and moderation—I mean Mr. Rose-Innes. Mr. Rose-Innes has declared in the strongest terms that to give back to the Boers any kind of independence would be merely sowing the seeds of further trouble and inviting future difficulty. That is the first thing. It does not follow that the future government of the two States should be exactly the same, or that the grant of self-government which will ultimately be made to them should be made to both at the same time. It is possible that we might find that the Orange Free State would more rapidly be in a position safely to enjoy these privileges and liberties than the Transvaal. The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition in a speech which he made in the country used, I think, an expression which rather surprised me. I am not quoting his words. I have not them in my mind, and he will no doubt tell me if I am wrong in interpreting them. Their meaning was to the effect that, in his opinion, there should be a military administration until such time as full self-government could be given, and that there should be no interval of Crown Colony government.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: My idea was, and is, that as long as your military occupation of the country continues, of course the government of the country, which is not a regular government, will be in military hands, and in that sense a military government. But if you proceed from that to take a further step, and constitute a regular form of Crown Colony government, it appeared to me when I spoke, and it appears to me still, that you commit yourself to a definite kind of autocratic government which would be more difficult to get rid of, and which would rather indicate that you would expect it to be a long time before you got another form of government. I hope I have made myself clear.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I think I correctly understood the right hon. Gentleman, though I did not represent him with so much fulness. Practically, I think, we are agreed as to his meaning. I wish to say that I take issue. It is not the intention of the Government to maintain indefinitely a military administration in the two conquered States. We hold that that would be one of the greatest mistakes that could possibly be made in view of our desire for an early and pacific settlement. We remember what happened when the Transvaal was annexed on the last occasion; we remember how difficulties were created by military administration; we believe that there are difficulties essential to military administration, and that without in any way implying blame to the military authorities. But the military authorities are not trained for the purposes of civil administration, and certainly, in our opinion, at the very earliest moment civil administration must be set up, and a civil administration as opposed to a military administration is what we call Crown Colony government. But the fact that we establish such a government with a view to make the condition of the country as easy as possible, to make as few breaks as possible with the past, is not to be taken as an indication that the government will last for long, or indeed as any indication whatever on the subject. The

question of the length of such an administration must depend on many circumstances which we now cannot anticipate, but especially, of course, on the way in which the Boers take to the new government which we shall set up. I am advised by those who, as I say, are most intimate with the country that it is the most improbable thing in the world that anything like continuous guerilla warfare will be maintained, that it is not in the habits of the Boers at the present moment. It must be remembered that although we sometimes speak of what is going on now as guerilla warfare, yet they are operations conducted by very large bodies of troops, numbering in some cases as many as 8,000, and in all cases having a very substantial number of guns and all warlike appliances. That is not guerilla warfare. What is meant by guerilla warfare, as we understand it from our knowledge of the Peninsular War, in which the Duke of Wellington commanded, I am, at all events, informed and advised we have not probably to fear. In sitting down I can only say that, although I recognise the enormous difficulties of the task which has been imposed upon us, I am hopeful, I am sanguine, that we shall bring it to a successful conclusion if we have the clear, the undoubted support of the nation behind us. If we could have had the warm authoritative support of the Opposition in this House, that is what I would have been best pleased to have had; if we could have shown that there was absolutely no party in this country on the question, I firmly believe, as I am standing here, that the war would have been brought to a conclusion before now. I believe, and I have some evidence to justify it, that the hope of reaction has prolonged the war, just as in the earlier stages of the war the Boers were encouraged to greater efforts by the hope of intervention. There may be no ground for accusing anybody, but there is ground for wishing, in the interest of this country, that, at all events, we shall have substantially a unanimous House behind us, and substantially a unanimous people behind us, in the difficulties we have still to face.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs): There was one portion of the speech of the Colonial Secretary with which I find myself in cordial agreement —namely, that in which he declared that he could not conceive it possible for any honest man who conscientiously believes that the war is an unjust and unrighteous war to do otherwise than think that the annexation of the two Republics is wrong, and that their independence ought to be restored. As to the rest of the speech, I I think it is one of the most extraordinary speeches I ever heard in this House. For my part, I rather admired it for what I would call its audacity. The right hon. Gentleman held up his hands in holy horror, and exclaimed that he could not imagine how anybody could regard his conduct with regard to South Africa with suspicion. He could not conceive how it was possible that his attitude should be so misconceived. "Suspicion!" he said. "On what basis of fact is this suspicion built?" Surely the right hon. Gentleman cannot have forgotten the Hawksley letters, the concealment of facts in the South African Committee. He cannot have forgotten the promotion of one of the men implicated in the raid — Sir Graham Bower — and the reinstatement of another of the conspirators — Mr. Newton. Indeed, the history of the last four or five years in South Africa is simply one record of facts, each and every one of them affording good, solid, substantial ground for suspecting the attitude of the right hon. Gentleman in everything that he does in South Africa. But there was another sentence which fell from him which was interesting as indicating one of the numerous changes of mind affected by the Colonial Secretary in the course of his brilliant career. Four or five years ago he considered that a war in South Africa would be a protracted war, a costly war, and would create endless bitterness and strife there; and he came to the conclusion that it would be an immoral proceeding. To-day, recanting these, amongst a good many other opinions formed in the course of his life, he declares that he has changed his mind, that he has had further knowledge since then. He has seen men who know the country. [HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!] That is perfectly true; but he had seen these men "who know the country," then, and it is rather curious that these men "who know the country" perfectly, thought that they could take Pretoria, the capital of the Transvaal, with 600 men! These were the men who had been living in the country all their lives, who were the

sources of information to the Imperial Government, upon which information the Imperial Government based their whole policy. These were the men who knew enough about the country that they thought they could do with 600 amateur soldiers that which it has taken an army of 250,000 men eight or nine months to do. These were the men who informed the Imperial Government that President Kruger would climb down. Why, there are people in this country who have never seen South Africa who have shown greater knowledge about South Africa than these other men who have lived in it all their lives, but who were blinded by local and racial feeling, and who could not be trusted in a matter of this kind. That is the unfortunate part of the whole business. The right hon. Gentleman has been studying the question possibly, but from what I can see, his mind is biassed by other considerations. Anybody who listened to his speech knows perfectly well that that speech had nothing whatever to do with South Africa. It was not a speech directed to South Africa, or having any connection with South Africa, and it was not intended to deal with the South African business. It was a speech intended purely for the hustings. It was an electioneering performance. I venture to say that there is no worse eye-glass than the ballot box; and it was through that glass that the right hon. Gentleman has been looking at all these facts. When he came to deal with disfranchisement, he misrepresented—I do not say that he did so wilfully—what was said by the late Under Secretary for the Colonies and my hon. and learned friend the Member for Dumfries Burghs. It was perfectly palpable what their proposition was. Their proposition was that disfranchisement may not be a severe form of penalty, but that it was the worst you can administer now. I would ask the supporters of the Government whether disfranchisement would ever have been thought of in this wholesale fashion had it not been that the parties in the Cape are so close, that the Dutch majority in the Cape Parliament is so small, that the disfranchisement of a few hundreds will transfer the domination from one party to the other? It is a purely political move, and that is what has vitiated the whole policy of the right hon. Gentleman. He is so essentially a political manager that he is always electioneering. He is a kind of political agent, and so permeated is he with that instinct that he has made up his mind that if this war cannot be a military success, at any rate he will make it an electioneering success. So in South Africa the right hon. Gentleman just manipulates the settlement in such a way that the Dutch Ministry shall be turned out and an English Ministry substituted. And in this country he is determined that this war should have one result—that is, a Chamberlain Ministry in the next Parliament. That is electioneering; it is not statesmanship; and it is not the way to settle the peace of South Africa. The worst of the whole business is that these are the considerations that have directed his entire policy, instead of considerations of statesmanship and conciliation which might have settled the whole thing without war. With the permission of the House, I should like for a moment—it is relevant to the motion for the reduction of the salary of the Colonial Secretary—to invite attention to the state of things which exists in South Africa, and contrast it with the position when the right hon. Gentleman came into office. In Cape Colony what was the state of things when he took office? It is true that they had an Englishman at the head of affairs. The right hon. Gentleman has just been denouncing the Afrikander Bond practically as a treasonable conspiracy. He said, "I have evidence." There has been too much so-called evidence which is kept back. Why should the right hon. Gentleman be the sole depository of all these confidences? This is, after all, nominally a democratic country. What has become of the right hon. Gentleman's rooted policy of taking the people into his confidence? Here is evidence which, according to him, is sufficient to ground an indictment against the people of South Africa, and yet he withholds it from Parliament. I have looked carefully into the Blue-books, and so far from finding any evidence of a conspiracy I only find that Sir Alfred Milner has filled them with the shavings and sawdust of the South African League workshop—clippings from newspapers and society gossip in South Africa. As a serious bit of evidence, there is a conversation with a gentleman called Schreiner, seventeen years ago, at a dinner party. Gentlemen who reveal the

confidences of a dinner party are the men on whose evidence you are going to indict a whole nation! This gentleman met a Mr. Wright at this dinner party. I have read the whole conversation, and Mr. Wright said nothing whatever to Mr. Schreiner about a conspiracy. But it was said that his countenance was stern with self-confidence, and that he wore a self-satisfied smile. Therefore that means that he wanted to expel the British flag from South Africa. If a self-satisfied smile and a countenance stern with self-confidence are sufficient to expel the British flag from South Africa, I cannot understand why there should be a Union Jack left within a hundred miles of Birmingham. And that is the sort of evidence on which we are asked to believe in this great conspiracy in South Africa! But the right hon. Gentleman says—"This is true; it may not be in the Blue-books, but I have evidence of it. It is within my bosom." It is time, I think, that we should get all these facts before the British public. It is the same thing in regard to the Boer treatment of the natives. What were we told in July last? The right hon. Gentleman said—

"We had charges against the Boer Government in regard to their treatment of the natives, but we kept them back."

To return to my main argument. I was pointing out what was the state of things in South Africa when the right hon. Gentleman came into office. There was an English Prime Minister, supported by a Dutch majority. What was the policy of this Prime Minister who was in office with the help of the Afrikander Bond? It is thus described by the right hon. Gentleman—

"Mr. Rhodes has told us here that it was his own view or idea to secure the union of the States in South Africa, leaving to the other States a Republican form of Government, but at the same time the whole to be under the British flag so far as foreign relations were concerned."

The right hon. Gentleman whose policy was this was Prime Minister of the Cape, kept in power by this treasonable conspiracy known as the Afrikander Bond. His desire was to see a Confederation of the States of South Africa under the British flag. What was the attitude towards the Transvaal? Shortly before the right hon. Gentleman came into office, or shortly after, there was practically a quarrel between the Government of the Cape Colony and the Government of the Transvaal. The former was on the point of declaring war against the Transvaal, and were only waiting to get the consent of this country to do so. And that was the Government that was put in office with the support of the Dutch majority in Cape Colony. What is the position now? It has been described by the right hon. Gentleman himself. The very men who had supported Mr. Rhodes, and four English Prime Ministers in succession, are the people now indicted for rebellion, whose leaders are imprisoned or expatriated, and whom it is proposed we should deprive of the elementary rights of citizenship, because they cannot be entrusted with those rights so far as the British Empire is concerned. That is the change in the position in the Cape Colony; and the change in the Transvaal is quite as bad. In the Transvaal when the right hon. Gentleman came into office matters were progressing favourably, so far as reform was concerned. There was a strong Reform party in the Transvaal at that date. The head of the Liberal party came within 500 votes of being elected President. And it must not be forgotten that General Botha himself moved a resolution in the Volksraad in favour of reducing the period of qualification for the franchise to five years, and came within four votes of carrying it. [An. HON. MEMBER: How many voted on each side?] There were ten for and fourteen against. That shows the progress the Reform party was making at that time. The Reform candidate for the Presidency came within 500 votes of being elected over President Kruger. Now all these men are endued with hostility to Great Britain. As for the Orange Free State, when the right hon. Gentleman came into office, it was perfectly friendly. Now it is so hostile that its forces are in the field against us, and you have been mean enough to wipe out the word "Free" from the very name of that Colony. When you come to the effect of your policy in South Africa upon the Empire at large, it is found to be most disastrous. We have been obliged to drop all those great proposals for domestic reform of which the right hon. Gentleman claimed to be the apostle. And when you come to consider how it has paralysed the power and arms of Great Britain abroad

the policy might very well be described in the phrase of the right hon. Gentleman himself as calamitous. One thing has struck me. Hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite are wont to congratulate themselves upon the fact that the European Powers have not offered to intervene. But has it never occurred to them to consider what is the reason why those European Powers which are hostile to us, who hate us, and are willing to strike a blow at the very existence of this Empire, have not intervened and have not talked of intervening? The only offer of mediation has come from the one Power in the world which is perfectly friendly to us—from that State the Government of which is so friendly to us that it has imperilled its existence owing to its sympathy with Great Britain. The reason is that the Powers that hate and dislike us do not want to stop the terrible exhaustion of our power going on in South Africa. There is nothing that suits them better. You have simply to look at China and get your answer there. What is happening there? We are the Power which has the greatest interest in China. Our trade with China is greater than the aggregate trade of all the other Powers; and formerly we were the foremost Power in settling Chinese affairs. But what is the position now? We have been reduced to the position of a third-rate Power in the settlement of the affairs of the Chinese Empire. [An HON. MEMBER: No.] I will give the hon. Member the facts. Russia and Japan have each got in China more troops than we have; therefore in that respect we are a third-rate Power. But not only that. Why is it that in order to protect our own Minister and our own people we have to appeal to an Oriental Power? Why is it that we have to appeal to a Bhuddist Power to protect our own missionaries? It is because the whole reserves of the Empire have been pledged in this terrific struggle going on in South Africa. Let these two facts rest in the mind of our great Imperial statesmen who are so proud of the Empire. I venture to say that if the House of Commons, if the Cabinet, if the right hon. Gentleman the Colonial Secretary himself, had foreseen twelve months ago the condition into which this war would have brought us, they would not have rejected President Kruger's terms in August and September last. The right hon. Gentleman, in answering the speech of my hon. and learned friend, said that to talk of suffering was irrelevant. That is an extraordinary declaration to make. He said, "What is the loss of 8,000 men killed on the one side and 3,000 or 4,000 on the other; what is the maiming of 40,000 for life?—and that is only the beginning of it. All that is perfectly irrelevant!" Surely in a question of this kind the suffering undergone is more or less relevant. Does not the price you are to pay come in when you are considering whether you should go to war? At least the Prime Minister thought so. We had a perfectly good case for war against France in regard to Madagascar, but Lord Salisbury came to the conclusion that British trade in Madagascar was not worth the immense suffering and sacrifice of life that would be produced by a war with France. It was because the right hon. Gentleman did not foresee what would happen, because he was misled by his own prejudices and prepossessions and by the men "who know the country" that he went into this terrible war in South Africa. I would ask the Committee what is it we have gained by this war? Taking the facts as they are at the present moment I venture to say that as far as regards all the objects we set before ourselves when we entered into the war, we are worse off now than before it began. We entered into the war in order to establish equal rights between the white races in the Transvaal. That was the avowed, open, and declared object. How do we stand now, even according to the declaration of the Colonial Secretary? Equal rights! Not at all. The first thing is that you have got to conquer the territory, and that will take at least a year. And then there is to be a military occupation. Afterwards you will set up a Crown Colony, which is to last according to the behaviour of the Boers. But, taking the right hon. Gentleman's own previous declaration, this feud may last for generations. Does he believe that if he annexes these two Republics he will restore peace and amity in ten or fifteen years, so that you can trust them with self-government? And what does a Crown Colony mean? A Crown Colony does not mean giving votes to anybody. You cannot set up self-government in the Transvaal and enfranchise the Uitlanders alone. The right hon. Gentleman knows that

perfectly well. He deprives everybody of votes, and governs that State by means of nominees of the Crown. We started the war in order to obtain the franchise for everybody, and we end it with the franchise for nobody. It is true that you establish a kind of equality between the white races there, but it is not equal rights, but equal wrongs. They are all to be deprived of the franchise. Now, what would have happened if there had been no war? President Kruger offered a seven years franchise, or a five years franchise on conditions—nine-tenths of which the right hon. Gentleman himself considered satisfactory. Supposing the Bill granting the seven years franchise had been unsatisfactory—although it is not for the right hon. Gentleman to assume that it would be; President Kruger offered to refer it to an inquiry, as suggested by the right hon. Gentleman himself—assuming that it would have been unsatisfactory, it would not have lasted for ever. It is perfectly true that the reform leaders in the Transvaal were the men of real power in that country. Who were the leaders of reaction? President Kruger and Commandant Cronje—both old men. In the ordinary course of things they could not have lasted long. Their power was a diminishing and dwindling force in the Republic. Who were the leaders of the reform party? General Botha, the two Generals De Wet, and Lucas Meyer, and others—all men who have been brought to the front by this war. They are young men, and were pledged to reform and to granting the rights of citizenship to the Uitlanders, while the men who were pledged to reaction and denying the rights of citizenship to the Uitlanders were old men with diminishing influence. The young men pledged to free franchise were of growing influence in the State. All this means that if we had not gone into this wretched war, we would have had the franchise and equal rights in seven or ten years at the outside; and what would have been spared to humanity? Eight thousand and more of our own soldiers dead! And the worst of a war like this is, that it is not the guilty persons who are punished, but the innocent. I know not who is responsible for this war. President Kruger? It may be; but he is not the man to be punished. It may be the right hon. Gentleman himself—as I believe—but he is not the man to be punished for it. What had these 8,000 British troops who had been killed done? What had the 450,000 men, women, and children who have been turned out of their homes and are roaming over the veldt in the Transvaal done? Yes, or even these poor burghers in the field? They, at any rate, had profited nil by the corruption of President Kruger and his Hollander gang. That is the worst of it. If we had only waited with patience all would have come out well in five or ten years, and the suffering, the detestation, and the stain on the name of Great Britain would have been spared. [HON. MEMBERS: Oh!] Yes, all that would have been saved. And I will tell the Committee what more, in my opinion, would have been gained. We should have gained the confidence and loyalty of those men in Cape Colony. [Laughter.] Why should hon. Members laugh at the loyalty of 250,000 of their own fellow citizens of the Empire in South Africa, who never, until provoked by this war, had given the slightest indication of disloyalty, but supported the British Ministry? That is what we would have gained, but we made matters worse instead of improving them by this war. What else have we set ourselves to accomplish? The peace of South Africa. That is an argument I have heard in this House and outside it. It was said that the war was necessary in the interests of peace in South Africa, and that it would put an end to those causes of disturbance in the Transvaal. What have you gained so far as peace is concerned? The whole fighting prior to the war, and the whole disturbances, were purely local. There was no bloodshed in Cape Colony or Natal, or in the Transvaal or the Orange Free State—none after the Jameson raid on Johannesburg. Only a little disturbance which the police could settle. But what have you done by this war? You have covered South Africa with the blood of the bravest men which our own country and their country could provide. That is how peace in South Africa has been restored. But it is said that we want to establish the paramountcy of Great Britain. That was unnecessary. There are two things which I think the Committee ought to take into account in this respect. President Kruger did two things which showed that, however he might object to the name of suzerainty, he recognised the paramountcy of this country. First of all, he discussed his

own internal affairs, and the very Bills which he submitted to his own Parliament, with the Imperial High Commissioner. What country in the world would have done that? Would Switzerland have discussed its own Bills regarding internal reforms with this country? Certainly not. Another thing he agreed to, and that was that in the matter of arbitration between this country and the Transvaal he was perfectly willing that no outsider should be introduced. Is that not a recognition of the paramountcy, real and effective paramountcy, of Great Britain? The right hon. Gentleman was not satisfied until he could get not merely the reality but the shadow of paramountcy, and he has got it. But, again, it was said that this war was entered into to re-establish British prestige, which had suffered at Majuba. The Prime Minister has declared that we entered into this war to revenge the humiliation of Majuba, and to restore the proper credit of this country. I ask hon. Members, will they venture to say that this war has re-established British prestige in South Africa or elsewhere? A force of 250,000 of the picked and trained men, not only of this country, but of the colonies, is required to crush 35,000 peasants. [HON. MEMBERS: Oh!] Well, I am taking as my authority Mr. Cecil Rhodes. At the present moment I do not believe that anyone would even assert that there are more than 20,000 Boers in the field. How does that re-establish our prestige or avenge Majuba? It is with regret that I speak of it; there is a sense of humiliation in it. My own countrymen have been captured, and who can think of that without a sense of shame? But in this war during the last ten months we have been beaten in battles in which the loss was greater than all the men engaged on both sides at Majuba. Why, we have had a dozen Majubas. Revenging Majuba! You have overshadowed Majuba with the ghastlier tragedies of Magersfontein and Spion Kop. You may have destroyed the Conventions of 1881 and 1884; you may have wiped out the humiliation attached to the memory of Majuba, but you have substituted for it a proclamation which turned women and children in the depth of winter from their own homes into the African desert; and you call that restoring British prestige in South Africa. On the contrary, British prestige has suffered, and no one will deny that this great war has done nothing more than to multiply grief and poverty. As for our military reverses, it is not for me to dwell upon them; but, at any rate, there is in them no restoring of prestige. I remember perfectly well the great cry at the last General Election was "Support home industries," and the Government, and above all, the Minister who got his party into power on the prohibition of foreign brushes, is now engaged in the task of restoring British prestige with guns made in Germany, soldiers fed on French vegetables and South American meat, Hungarian horses provided with American saddles, and foreign fodder carried by Spanish mules. That is how we are restoring British prestige and the credit of the country. The fact is that this war was based on a gross miscalculation—upon a series of miscalculations. It was calculated that with 47,000 men we could conquer these two Republics. It is rather unfortunate to consider what that miscalculation was based upon. It was not a miscalculation of the Intelligence Department. It was not that we were taken by surprise by the military preparations of the Boers. The Under Secretary for War declared that they knew perfectly well at the War Office the number of men that the two Republics could turn out, the number of their guns, and the amount of ammunition they had; in fact, that they rather exaggerated the power of the Boers than otherwise. The miscalculation was a miscalculation of statesmanship—a miscalculation as to the character, disposition, ideals, and tenacity of the men with whom we had to deal. And that miscalculation must rest entirely on the shoulders of the right hon. Gentleman himself. He has led us into two blunders. The first was the war. But worse than the war is the change that has been effected in the purpose for which we are prosecuting the war. We went into the war for equal rights; we are prosecuting it for annexation. That is a most serious change in the tactics of the Government from any point of view. There may be something to be said for a war so long as it is entered upon for an unselfish purpose. The influence of a war must always be brutalising, at best; but still, if you enter upon it for an unselfish purpose there is something which almost consecrates the sacrifices, bloodshed, and suffering endured. But when you enter

upon a war purely and simply for the purposes of plunder, I know of nothing which is more degrading to the country or more hideous in its effects on the mind and character of the people engaged in it. Anyone who looks at the illustrated papers must see the horrible presentments given of incidents which were formerly relegated to prints like the *Police Gazette*—details which I cannot give to the House without a gross breach of good taste. Incidents of that kind are not given for the purpose of producing any disgust in the minds of the people, but with every circumstance of indication that they are there to invoke admiration. And all these are circulated broadcast in every household throughout the country. The right hon. Gentleman the Colonial Secretary in a speech quoted by the hon. Member for Cockermouth said that a war in order to impose internal reforms upon President Kruger would be an immoral war. If that be so, I ask the right hon. Gentleman or any of his friends to find an adjective sufficiently expressive of the character of a war entered upon for the purposes of annexation. The right hon. Gentleman admitted that we had no right to meddle in the affairs of the Transvaal, and that there was only one possible justification for it—that our motive was an unselfish one. We have thrown that justification away now. It is exactly as if you had entered into a man's house to protect the children, and started to steal his plate. You entered into these two Republics for philanthropic purposes, and remained to commit burglary. In changing the purpose of the war you have made a bad change. That is the impression you are creating abroad. Our critics say you are not going to war for equal rights and to establish fair play, but to get hold of the goldfields; and you have justified that criticism of our enemies by that change. But, worst of all, a change has been effected in the character of the war. Up to a certain point it was conducted with considerable chivalry, and, so far as war can be so conducted, with apparent good temper on both sides. A war of annexation, however, against a proud people must be a war of extermination, and that is unfortunately what it seems we are now committing ourselves to — burning homesteads and turning women and children out of their homes. The telegram received from Pretoria, and which had passed the military censor, stated that fact, and I do not think he would have let it come unless it was true. It is also confirmed from Lorenzo Marques by information that 600 women and children have been turned out and sent to the hills. There has been the burning of the homesteads of the rebels, and this war will brutalise the people, and the savagery which must necessarily follow will stain the name of this country. It seems to me that in this war we have gradually followed the policy of Spain in Cuba. The action of the Spaniards in Cuba produced such a feeling in America that they could not tolerate it, and we know how that war degraded the name of Spain. This is the state of things into which the right hon. Gentleman has brought us. During nine or ten months warfare we have lost between 40,000 and 50,000 men, there has been enormous expense, and the end is not yet in sight. And this Government, the advent of which we were told would terrorise all other governments abroad, has been reduced to the necessity of appealing to Japan to protect its own Ministers in China. The right hon. Gentleman has made up his mind that this war shall produce electioneering capital to his own side. He is in a great hurry to go to the country before the facts are known. He wants to have the judgment of the people in the very height and excitement of the fever. He wants a verdict before the pleadings are closed and before "discovery" has been obtained. He does not want the documents to come, but he wants to have the judgment of the country upon censored news, suppressed despatches, and unpaid bills. The right hon. Gentleman may not be a statesman, but he is an expert electioneerer, and in his desire to go to the country before the country realises what the war means he is the one man who pronounces the deepest condemnation upon his own proceedings.

Mr. Lloyd-George.

*Mr. EVELYN CECIL (Hertford): I have been very much struck with the extreme poverty of the arguments used by hon. Members opposite in regard to the past, and the extreme timidity with which they have touched questions about the future. The hon. Gentleman who has just sat down has given us one of his eloquent and bitter speeches, but it does not take us very much further. He has told us

that the Colonial Secretary is really electioneering. I do not know whether his own speech was intended also as an electioneering speech, but I have my doubts as to whether it will be very highly appreciated as such. He has used arguments to try and show that in China we have been reduced to a third-rate Power in consequence of this war in South Africa. The sophistical nature of this argument is apparent. He has also told us that President Kruger admitted the paramountcy of Great Britain. Was the hon. Member bearing in mind that several of the leaders of the Boers claimed that the Transvaal was a sovereign international State, and that Mr. Reitz deliberately used this phrase in his despatch of May 9, 1899? He also stated that the war was not unselfish, but that we had simply been watching for an opportunity to acquire the gold mines. Everybody knows perfectly well the imperial system of colonial Governments, and as soon as we can in this case, as in others, we intend to grant responsible governments to the colonies, and therefore it is the colonies and the local territory that will really reap the benefit which is to be obtained by the taking over of the Transvaal and the Orange Free State. We have had a speech from the hon. Member for Poplar. That speech did not add very much to the practical solution for the future, and his arguments were chiefly to assert that we went to war to obtain the franchise for the Uitlanders, and the result of the war was to disfranchise the Boers. The answer to this he supplied himself, for not very long afterwards he stated that the war has lasted so long that it has made the whole position a very different one. Of course war always alters the situation, and you cannot expect that the conditions will be precisely the same after the war as they are before, and it is idle to draw arguments of that description from the circumstances that have arisen. The hon. Member has also told us that Her Majesty's Government by their want of preparation for this war have practically made these men rebels. This, again, is an extraordinary statement which shows the nature of the speeches to which we have been listening. The hon. Member last year told us that our preparations were too many, too extensive, and too great, and it is almost childish now to turn round and assert that it is want of preparation that has made these men rebels. Even if the Government had made more preparation I suppose it can hardly be denied that their feelings would have been just the same. I will now come to a more practical consideration of the South African problem. We have to consider the question of the future government of the Transvaal and the Orange Free State. It has been suggested that there are two immediate courses, either that we should rule the two Republics like a Crown colony, or else place them under military government. I venture to think that in the particular case of South Africa the two terms "Crown colony" and "military government" are practically synonymous. If you have a purely military government you will be subject to the same disadvantages as occurred in the Transvaal, in 1877, when Sir Owen Lanyon was at the head of the annexed administration, and if you are to have a really successful Crown Colony government it will require a military force behind it. It is also largely a question of the length of time for which this kind of government will be required. I think we are all agreed that after the war is over we must have a responsible government as soon as possible. I take issue here with the hon. Member for Poplar, the whole tone of whose speech was to urge that we were jerrymandering if we did not grant a responsible government at once. I deny *in toto* such an accusation, and those who are in favour of a responsible government being established at once should remember that there are many practical difficulties in the way of that course being adopted. How can you grant responsible government until, at any rate, the question of the indemnity tax is settled?—for otherwise you would be putting the regulation of the payment of that tax into the hands of those who have been openly fighting against us. It ought to be remembered, too, that you are incurring a very grave risk in this respect, for you may be sure that Dr. Leyds and his Hollanders will take the earliest opportunity as soon as a responsible government is restored of coming back to the country and agitating to produce the same condition of unrest and inequality again, and make the whole settlement impossible. That would be a fictitious agitation showing vindictiveness against the success of British arms, and against the freedom

of British government, but it is only too likely to occur. These are matters which deserve serious consideration, and I have no doubt that, in spite of the jeers of hon. Gentlemen opposite, her Majesty's Government will take great care to successfully overcome the difficulty. No doubt there are other difficulties. The hon. and learned Member for Dumfries has referred to the question of disarmament. Personally I do not see how any policy but that of disarmament can be adopted at the present time. We have had too many examples of the results of leniency during the present war to come to any other conclusion than that leniency must be tempered by judgment. I am anxious to be as lenient as possible, but when you have firing on the white flag, and Boers returning to their lost farms, and then going over to the enemy again and taking up arms afresh, notwithstanding that they had promised under parole not to do so, it is very doubtful whether there is very much sense of gratitude in the Boers. There is, of course, much to be said with regard to the attitude of the natives. We must bear in mind that it is only just and it is necessary also that the white man should be armed against any native attack. In consideration of this fact, it might be ultimately possible, having now partly reduced the number of rifles in the hands of the Boer population, still further to reduce the amount of ammunition they are given. I only only throw that out as a suggestion in view of the native difficulty. There is another difficulty in regard to the taxes in connection with the indemnity. I am confident that when there is a just administration it will be found that the illegal and irregular taxes and monopolies are sufficient when they have been removed to enable just taxes to be put in their place, which will, without offence, largely contribute to the indemnity. I refer, for example, more particularly to the tax which has hitherto been imposed by the Transvaal Government in connection with the dynamite monopoly with foodstuffs and the enormously high railway rates which have been charged by the Netherlands Railway. There is a another aspect of the situation, and it is one which has been touched upon by my hon. friend the Member for Durham. We are all anxious to do the best we can for the future of the country. We are all anxious as soon as the war is over to show what British energy, and science and development can produce, for we know that it will bring real advantages to that unfortunate country.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): Like the case of Ireland.

*MR. EVELYN CECIL: I have every hope that the Inter-Departmental Committee, which is to consider the question of the settlement of colonists and soldiers, will produce a scheme which will be of real benefit to the country. The climate is generally excellent in the Transvaal and Orange River Colony. More markets are needed and more skilled labour is wanted, as against the unskilled labour which is to be obtained from the natives. A greater development of railways is needed, without which you cannot bring the produce to the markets, and without which you will find produce grown without there being any convenient markets for it. You will be able to develop industries in new portions of the country. You will be able, I am certain, to grow more wheat in the Orange River Colony, which is a very good wheat-growing land, especially near Basutoland, where I am informed only about one-fifteenth of the wheat is grown that could be grown under proper management.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Give them a Board of Agriculture.

*MR. EVELYN CECIL: You will be able to develop fruit growing as well. One of the most noticeable things in times of peace in South Africa is that nearly everybody is supplied with tinned food. That shows that insufficient attention has been paid in the past to the possibilities of the country for growing the ordinary necessaries of life. I have every confidence that the inquiries to be made by the Inter-Departmental Committee which has been promised will result in great good to South Africa. I have not mentioned such industries as the making of bricks.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Without straw.

*MR. EVELYN CECIL: The hon. Member is mistaken, for there is plenty of straw there. Brick-clay exists in many places. I also venture to think that this

interruption is dictated by ignorance, because nearly all the buildings there are made of corrugated iron, which is extremely hot under a tropical sun. Really, I think many hon. Members opposite from Ireland are animated more by a desire to sneer at the policy of the Government than to listen to practical facts about South Africa. Gold, diamond, and coal mines are already worked, and my object has been to show that there are plenty of other industries which the colonists can undertake with advantage and profit. I know the difficulties are not small, and I do not wish to minimise them, but I am certain that they can be overcome. Difficulties arise in regard to the supply of water, but are largely remedied by storing rain-water in tanks, by sinking wells, by irrigation, where possible, from the rivers. By new scientific inoculation and other means we can get rid of many of the troublesome animals——

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Yes, the Boers.

*MR. EVELYN CECIL: Such as locusts, which exist there. And various districts which have already been open to civilisation in South Africa show by experience that there is less malaria in those districts now than before. I have intervened in this debate partly because I wish to show that the speeches of hon. Gentlemen opposite were extremely unpractical, and were perhaps dictated by some feeling of electioneering anxiety, and partly because I believe that much practical good can be done to South Africa through the medium of British rule, and of the energy which has been hitherto wanting.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): I do not quite follow the argument of the hon. Member who has just sat down in favour of this war, but so far as I understand him, he is of the opinion that after we have spent £100,000,000 and lost thousands of the lives of our fellow countrymen, the inhabitants of the Transvaal in future will be able to live in houses made of bricks instead of iron. I can hardly think that that is a fair justification of the war. He also told us to draw our experience from Ireland. It appears that we have treated Ireland well and nobly, and yet the Irish Members are not grateful. Now we find that the Transvaalers are not grateful, and I should like to know why they should be grateful. Admitting that we are right in this war, is it likely that the Transvaalers would think so themselves? Can they be expected to be grateful to us for shooting them down, burning their houses, and dragging their women into the desert? We are told that we ought to pursue the war to the bitter end. My hon. friend behind me said the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Colonial Secretary was rather addressed to England than to South Africa. I will go a step further and say that it struck me that the speech of the Colonial Secretary was rather addressed to his own side than to our side. We know that on the other side there are some hon. Gentlemen who are anxious for a speedy election, and there are others who are not so desirous. The right hon. Gentleman himself is in favour of a speedy election, and the gist of his speech seems to be that we ought to have an election at once if the Opposition dared to differ in one single word from the Government. The Government has a large majority and can vote down our opposition, and yet, although they can vote us down, if we dare to express an opinion that the Government is not entirely right in the settlement they suggest in regard to the future of South Africa, at once Parliament is to be dissolved and the Government is to appeal to the country on the subject. That is a new doctrine not known to any of the predecessors of the right hon. Gentleman. When Mr. Disraeli came home from Berlin with his "Peace with honour," he was urged to dissolve at once, but he had a great respect for the Parliament of England and the Constitution of the country, and he did not think it right and legitimate merely upon a snap dissolution to get a snap majority, and so he put the election off. It is perfectly true that when the election took place a little later he was defeated, but at any rate he had the satisfaction of knowing that he had behaved as an honest and honourable statesman. The right hon. Gentleman considers that anybody who votes in favour of the reduction moved by my hon. friend the Member for Cockermouth must agree with every single word which has been said by the mover. Did anybody ever hear of such a doctrine? This is the Colonial Office Vote, and

a motion has been made to reduce the salary of the right hon. Gentleman by £100. Personally, the only hesitation I have in voting for this Amendment is that I am implying that I think the right hon. Gentleman ought to have £4,900. That is my own feeling, but I have got a dozen other reasons for voting for this Amendment. I think it is through the action of the right hon. Gentleman that we have this war at all, and I object to his interference with military commanders. But even if I admitted that the war is perfectly just I should have voted for this Amendment, because I am opposed to the action which the right hon. Gentleman intends to take in regard to the future settlement of South Africa. Then there is another extraordinary doctrine. The right hon. Gentleman said he considered it was a mean and despicable thing to do for anyone who did not vote either "aye" or "no" upon this question. I hope that every hon. Gentleman on this side will vote against the salary of the right hon. Gentleman. I am bound to say that the views expressed by the right hon. Gentleman are singularly unfortunate, because I remember not long ago his action when the present Lord James, an eminent leader of the Liberal Unionist party, moved a resolution in regard to the Indian cotton duties. But where was the right hon. Gentleman when the Vote came on and the question was put? Everybody looked round for him, but he was not there. Certainly the right hon. Gentleman does not practise what he preaches. The right hon. Gentleman told us that there was a certain amount of suspicion felt in South Africa with regard to himself, and that it was not due to his own action, but was owing to the speeches of hon. Members on the Front Opposition Bench, who had absolutely told the people of South Africa that they ought to suspect him. I do not think there is anything ignoble about it if the late Attorney General did say that there was cause for suspicion. The facts are all there. We know perfectly well that the right hon. Gentleman went out of his way to laud up Mr. Rhodes, although at another time he practically stated that Mr. Rhodes was a most dishonourable man. Surely statements like those are enough to lead to some sort of suspicion on the part of the Afrikanders in South Africa. Surely there is still some ground for the belief that the right hon. Gentleman is taking some partisan interest in Mr. Rhodes. But this is not a question so much of the particular speech of the right hon. Gentleman. I am one of the great admirers of his eloquence from a rhetorical standpoint. The right hon. Gentleman always takes up two or three of the weakest arguments used, and he assumes that these are the only arguments, and then he proceeds to misconstrue them, he shrugs his shoulders, and when the hon. Member attacked gets up to put the right hon. Gentleman right he refuses to give way. The right hon. Gentleman's speech is a proof of the great rhetorical ability which he possesses, but it is more fitted to come from below the gangway than from a responsible Minister of the Crown. The real question is, what ought we to do now under the present circumstances? We know that a war has taken place, and we know that you cannot put things precisely in the same position as they were before the war. What we ought to devote ourselves entirely to is, what is the best thing to be done now in the permanent interests of South Africa and the Empire. I want to put an end to this racial feud which now exists, and which the right hon. Gentleman tells us existed for generations before the war took place. I should have thought that the war would have tended to increase this racial feud, and I was sorry the right hon. Gentleman did not state the reasons why he had altered his opinion. He said it was a prophecy, but I do not believe in the prophecies of the right hon. Gentleman either before or after the war; in fact, I do not believe in any prophecies whatsoever from anybody. What are we to do in regard to these two Republics and in regard to Cape Colony? We have had two Blue-books issued on this subject. The first book was full of newspaper cuttings, but the second book is interesting reading, because it shows the intentions and the views of the right hon. Gentleman, and what was passing in his mind, much more clearly than the speeches he has made in this House. The Cape Ministry did not ask the opinion of the right hon. Gentleman. My hon. friend said his opinion was asked by the Cape Ministry, but I cannot find anything in these Blue-books which said that anybody asked for the opinion of the right hon. Gentleman. I have read a long letter from Sir Alfred Milner in which the Cape

Ministry represent to Her Majesty's Government their views in regard to the treatment of rebels. They say that they wish their views to be represented to the right hon. Gentleman, but they did not ask him what his views were. We know that his views were different to those of the Cape Ministry. The Cape Ministry proposed to indemnify all except the ringleaders, but the right hon. Gentleman was indignant at that, and he started a very curious doctrine. He said he objected to it because it was unjust to the loyalists. The right hon. Gentleman suggested that there should be a roving Commission to smell out the rebels and to get evidence against them, I presume from the loyalists, and this was to be the basis of the action brought against the rebels. It was proposed also that those rebels who had provided food for the Boers should be punished. For these offenders it was proposed that they should be punished by being deprived of their votes for the rest of their natural lives if they pleaded guilty. But if they did not plead guilty they might be punished in many ways as well. A sort of pressure is to be put upon these people. They are to go before a judicial Commission. If they plead guilty they will only be punished by their vote being taken away, but if they do not plead guilty they will be liable to many other additional penalties. It has been said that it would be almost impossible to try such men by a jury. And so you are to bully and tease these men into pleading guilty, on the understanding that if they do so they will have no punishment beyond being disfranchised. We are told that some 10,000 of these rebels took up arms against us. We will suppose that there are 10,000 who aided and abetted, and who will be brought under the purview of this law. The right hon. Gentleman has now given up the life disqualification, and he says they are to be disqualified for five years. We know what the object of this is, and it is a jerrymandering object. The real reason for this proposal has slipped out in the course of the right hon. Gentleman's speech. You have two parties—one of them was in power, and the other got in power at the last election, and they happen to have a majority in the country. Now the right hon. Gentleman the Colonial Secretary wants to lay hold of about 20,000 of these persons to disfranchise them in order to put in power the other party. And who is the other party? Why, it is the right hon. Gentleman's own particular friend, Mr. Rhodes, who was defeated at the last general election by the votes of these persons. These men are to be disfranchised simply to put out of power those who have a majority at present, and in order to put in power those who are in a minority and who were defeated at the last general election. By the proposal of the right hon. gentleman the property of these 20,000 people is, in many cases, to be confiscated, and to whom is it to go? It is to go to indemnify the loyalists. When there are two parties in the Cape like this, the loyalists will be the people who administer justice, and if these loyalists know that the amount of money they are to receive by way of indemnity is to be exactly the amount they are to get from their political opponents, heaven help those political opponents. The right hon. Gentleman told us that a great many members of the Dutch community were loyal. Have we not always said so? I believe they were perfectly loyal. There were exceptions to the rule, but these loyal men have now to be put out of power—it is these loyal Dutch who are to be deprived of power. The Cape Ministers protested against the action of the right hon. Gentleman, and Mr. Schreiner proposed some sort of compromise. His party protested against his action, and Mr. Schreiner resigned, and he has now gone over bag and baggage to the enemy. Sir Gordon Sprigg has now been put into power, and he is a gentleman who was defeated at the last general election. And who is Sir Gordon Sprigg? He is simply the dummy of Mr. Rhodes. The right hon. Gentleman does not seem to understand anything about the game, and he does not understand the personal element in this question. The right hon. Gentleman told us that Mr. Rose-Innes is known for his impartiality; but he is known as a sort of Liberal Unionist who is ready to join one party one day and another party the next. Is Mr. Rose-Innes an impartial man? Why, anyone in South Africa would laugh at the suggestion, just as we would laugh at the notion of impartiality in some hon. Members of this House. Let the right hon. Gentleman and the Cape Ministry agree on some sort of amnesty. I cite the case of Canada.

Canada was on all fours with Cape Colony. There were two races, the French and the English. The French were anxious to join with the United States, and they confederated with certain leaders in the United States. What happened when the war was over? There was first a policy of revenge, confiscation, and disfranchisement proposed. But Lord Durham protested against it, and thanks to him an amnesty was declared. Some of the leaders were punished, but there was no general disfranchisement. What was the result? Canada is now one of the most loyal of our Colonies, and all friction between the two races has disappeared. Will the right hon. Gentleman inform the Cape Ministry that Canada is an analogous case? He will not, because he does not think, and never will think, that anything that is contrary to what he wishes can be analogous, or right or just. In some things I admire the right hon. Gentleman. He has a peculiar mind. He does know what he wants, and, unlike some other people, he takes the best steps he can to attain it. No doubt the right hon. Gentleman struggles to be impartial, but God has made him in such a way that it is absolutely impossible for him to be impartial. He must either be on one side or the other, and he is ready to do anything to attain the end he has in view. Very likely he thinks his own opinion is right, and he is right in standing by it; but what the right hon. Gentleman cannot understand is how any one can think that his opinion may be wrong, and he is perpetually jeering and sneering and abusing hon. Members on this side because we think that he may be in the wrong and not in the right. As regards rebellion, there is a good deal to be said for it on general principles. Who would now be called the greatest man in the history of the United States? Why, Washington. And who is known as the greatest man in England? Hampden. I remember the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for North Armagh making a speech in which he complained of our unpatriotic conduct in thinking that there might be some excuse for rebellion. But I remember when we were discussing the Irish question that the right hon. and gallant Gentlemen gloried in the fact that if Home Rule were granted he would himself be a rebel. Some hon. Gentlemen opposite said that in that event they would "die in the last ditch," but the right hon. and gallant Gentleman was more practical. He said he would not die in the last ditch, but that he would kill all of us in it. As to the question whether a person is right or wrong in being a rebel, I cannot see that a rebel must necessarily be wrong, though I think it would have been better for these people in South Africa if they had kept quiet. They had, however, sons and brothers who were fighting on the Boer side, and it was natural and human that they should strongly sympathise with their own race. Moreover, they did not rebel in any part of the colony where the Republicans were unable to go. It was only where the Republicans had occupied a district that they broke into rebellion and joined them. But that was the fault of the Government in not defending the colonies. The Government thought that the war was to be a sort of cheerful picnic to Pretoria, and they sent out an insufficient number of men. The Boers invaded our territory, which they ought never to have been able to do if the Government had realised what the difficulties were. I put it that it is infinitely more the fault of the Government than of these individuals that they were forced into a position in which they had to choose between the actual forces in command of the district, forces which represented their own kith and kin, and the Government with which they had ceased to have any sympathy after what had taken place. For it must be remembered that the Government of Cape Colony proposed that the colony should remain neutral, and so far as I know there was no protest from the right hon. Gentleman as to that. It seemed to me that the right hon. Gentleman recognised the difficult position of the colony itself, and was perfectly agreeable that it should remain neutral. Under these circumstances, if England is at war, and it is understood that a colony is to remain neutral, the position of the people in that colony is undoubtedly very exceptional and difficult, and should be taken into consideration when all is over. I do not put it on high ground; I put it on the ground of mere expediency. You have never yet gained over a people by maintaining a policy of confiscation and disfranchisement after a civil war. I defy anyone to show where such a policy has ever succeeded. What we ought to do,

apart from all questions as to whether the rebels were right in rebelling or not, is as soon as the rebellion is actually over to punish the ringleaders, and to grant a general amnesty to the people. How can you possibly suppose that you will get good feeling in South Africa when you have 20,000 men—equivalent to about one million here—who cannot vote, whose property has been confiscated, and who will see other people living on that property? You will never get by that policy the peace and harmony which we all desire in South Africa. We have not alluded to Sir Alfred Milner in this debate, though we have got a great deal from him in these Blue-books. It is curious that Sir A. Milner's despatches, whether sent by post or cable, always arrived in this country at a favourable moment to influence public opinion. We remember when his "helot" despatch arrived, though I could never understand why he should have telegraphed that rigmarole, except that it was to influence public opinion. Whenever a discussion is coming on in this House a despatch from Sir A. Milner backing up the policy of the Colonial Secretary is suddenly published. On 6th May Sir A. Milner wrote a despatch stating that at that time there was a conciliation party in South Africa. I should like to see a conciliation party in every country, composed of men who take a strong view, and who regard the interests of their country first. Sir A. Milner states that the term of conciliation party was a misnomer, because their policy was a direct negative to the policy of Her Majesty's Government, not a direct negative to the policy of the Cape Government, but a direct negative to the policy of the right hon. Gentleman. Sir A. Milner thinks that it is practically a criminal thing that the inhabitants of Cape Colony should dare to express an opinion contrary to the policy of Her Majesty's Government, but such a doctrine would do away with all opposition in this country. If it were a crime to differ from Her Majesty's Government, a set of men would have only to get into office to remain in for the rest of their natural lives. As Lord Randolph Churchill stated, though perhaps he put it too broadly, it is the duty of an Opposition to oppose, and if they believe that the policy of the Government is a wrong policy they are only fulfilling their duty as members of this House in opposing it. That Sir A. Milner should accuse these men of committing a crime because they opposed the policy of the right hon. Gentleman is really making the right hon. Gentleman a kind of dictator not only in this country, but throughout the whole Empire. Then Sir A. Milner goes on to say that the conciliation party was produced by politicians. How is any party produced in this country? It is not produced by the politicians or by their followers, but by politicians and followers together entertaining the same views. Sir A. Milner tells us in his despatch that for any exasperation of feeling that might result from the discussion of burning questions the conciliation party were to blame. Are they not to discuss burning questions? If the war is a burning question here, it is a far more burning question in South Africa, where it is a most vital question, and surely it is not a crime to discuss it as Sir A. Milner thinks. Here is an instance of the "impartiality" of Sir A. Milner, and I cannot help calling the attention of the House to it. Sir A. Milner may be a very excellent man; he may have many excellent qualities, but he is certainly not a man endowed with an impartial mind. Sir A. Milner complains that the language of the conciliation party was very strong, but he also admits that the language of what he calls the Loyalists was very strong as well. But he does not blame them. The Loyalists may use what language they like, but the other side are to be blamed if they use any strong language at all. Why should he protest against one side using strong language and not the other? I think all parties are united in believing that a policy of conciliation would be a desirable policy in South Africa, not only on grounds of fairness and justness, but also on the ground of expediency. Now, as to the Republics themselves, it is admitted that the Government of the Orange Free State was a most excellent Government, and it is admitted that President Steyn did his very best to prevent this war. [Some HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!] That is the distressing part of this subject. I really do not believe that two hon. Gentlemen on the other side of the House have ever read the Blue-book. If they took the trouble to do so they would see that President Steyn has been praised again and again by Sir A. Milner and by the Colonial Secretary because he did his

best to bring about an amicable arrangement and to prevent war with the Transvaal. He had a treaty with the Transvaal, and when the war broke out he was bound by that treaty. That is the position of President Steyn. Suddenly we have a proclamation announcing that the Orange Free State had been annexed to the Empire. We did not have any statement that that was done by Her Majesty's Government, and we were left to suppose that it was a military action by Lord Roberts. But we now see in these despatches that it was the right hon. Gentleman himself who directed Lord Roberts to annex the Orange Free State. For my part, I have always held that when we annex a country we ought not to do it by the action of the Executive, but ought to give Parliament an opportunity of expressing its views on the subject. We were not given any opportunity of expressing our opinion. We were not told that Her Majesty's Government had annexed the Free State, and whether that was right or wrong, I think it was very wrong for the right hon. Gentleman and the Government to prejudice the case as before Parliament. What would I do with the Orange Free State? I would give it back to the Free Staters, but I do not think there is the slightest probability of that. I have always observed that when we do lay hands on any territory, whether rightly or wrongly, the last thing we think of doing is to give it back. Therefore I will not urge that on the Government, because it would be a waste of time. But we have still to deal with the Transvaal, and the question is what shall we do with it. Why, surely it would be reasonable to submit to President Kruger some terms that he could possibly accept. The terms of the Government are absolute surrender; you tell him that he must give up his country, and that his country is to be annexed. If that were absolutely necessary for the safety of the Empire I could understand it, but does any hon. Gentleman opposite mean to tell me that if we were to take Johannesburg and leave the Transvaalers some sort of "reserve" as they call it in America, where their own flag might fly, where they might call themselves a Republic and live under their own habits and customs with every restriction as regards armaments—is it possible to conceive that that would be any danger to the Empire? I believe there would be no danger in it, and I believe that if we submitted such terms to the Transvaalers, though at first they might want more, they are in such a position now that they would accept them. Hon. Gentlemen opposite, if I am to judge by the newspapers, seem to put forward most extraordinary views as to what other people not English ought to do. They say that these Transvaalers ought to be very glad to become Englishmen because Englishmen enjoy the most excellent government possible, and a better government than the Transvaalers can enjoy in their own country. If we adopt that view we would be justified in annexing any country on the face of the globe. There are many countries worse governed than England, and if you say you will annex them because the people would be happier under British rule, you might annex the whole world. Never was such a doctrine known. Hon. Gentlemen must realise that whereas their love of England, in which we share, and their loyalty, in which we share, does them credit, at the same time even the inhabitants of a poor miserable country love their independence just as much as we love ours in this country. Love of country is not dependent on the country being rich or even being well governed. It is a natural and a noble sentiment, and if we crush it out in regard to the Transvaal, how can we protest against any species of annexation or against the crushing out of any nationality such as, by the Turks, in Armenia? I can understand after a war a country taking a province, as Germany did after the Franco-German war, but I do not know of any instance since the final partition of Poland of any independent nation being crushed absolutely out of existence in consequence of a successful war. We know perfectly well that the feeling of the whole world is against us. Even those countries which are friendly to us and admire us stand aghast at our professing this doctrine, and refusing to make peace until the Transvaalers have surrendered their nationality. We on this side are twitted with having no policy and with dealing in generalities. I am not dealing in generalities, and I have a policy of conciliation. If you will not give the Orange Free State back you will not, but I trust you will put an end to this war, and that you will allow these unfortunate Transvaalers to have

some district in Africa where they can still call themselves a Republic. There are two other things we might also do with advantage. I honestly do not think that the right hon. Gentleman the Colonial Secretary is anything but a very able man, and if you want to have this country at war the right hon. Gentleman is the very best man to have at the head of affairs, but after the war is over and you want to adopt a policy of conciliation I can conceive no man less fitted to bring it about than the right hon. Gentleman. I would therefore suggest that the right hon. Gentleman would do well to devote his exceptional talents to some other department of the State, and that we should have a new man at the Colonial Office. I would also suggest that Sir Alfred Milner should be appointed governor somewhere else, and that we should send out to South Africa a statesmen thoroughly independent and impartial, and tell him he is placed there to do his best for the Empire and to bring about good feeling in South Africa. I really believe you would do a great deal towards putting an end to the ill effects that must exist after this war if you would substitute for Sir A. Milner some other man. I am not suggesting that he should be a Liberal. Take one of your own men. There are plenty of men on your own side of the House, and plenty of eminent officials who might be sent out, and if you do this, and give the Transvaalers this "reserve," you will go very far in adopting a policy of conciliation, and removing the ill effects of the war, which must exist if you pursue a policy of confiscation; and what is more, you will go very far to putting an immediate end to the war.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The most interesting and remarkable episode in this debate occurred at a time when there were not so very Members present—I think about two or three o'clock—and when the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Colonies made an electioneering speech. It no doubt was quite foreign to the intention of the right hon. Gentleman, but it so happened that his observations, which were strong, took that form. In fact, that part of his speech might almost have been made by a member of a Government which thought that the patriotism of the country might be used for party purposes, if only the necessary stroke was given when the iron was hot, and who, not having obtained his way with his own colleagues, was trying whether he could do anything to raise a feeling in the House of Commons. It almost looked like that, but it was the speech of the Secretary of State for the Colonies in defending his own Vote—one of the most serious occasions of the year; and I am sure the right hon. Gentleman would be the last man in the world to prostitute such an occasion for party purposes. What the right hon. Gentleman said was that the verdict of the country would shortly be taken, and that that required not only a knowledge of the policy of the Government but a knowledge of the views of the Opposition, and he implied that in this particular instance the views of the Opposition were not known. It is an odd thing, but I should have put it just the other way—namely, that the country does know the views of the Opposition and is not acquainted with the ultimate policy of Her Majesty's Government; and I think I can appeal for confirmation of that view to the fact that a few minutes afterwards in the course of his speech the right hon. Gentleman took exception to some statements that I made in the country as to the proper course to be pursued after the war was ended, statements connected with the possibility of Crown Colony government being applied, and he quoted my words and argued against the argument that I used, thereby showing that he was not altogether ignorant of the views that I, at all events, entertain. But the right hon. Gentleman went further, and proceeded to dictate to us what we mean. He did not leave us to our own interpretation, but put his interpretation upon it. I wonder by what authority he assumes the right to tell us what we mean. He said that anyone who voted with my hon. friend the Member for Cockermouth was declaring that the whole policy in South Africa was wrong, that the war was wrong, that it should be stopped, and that annexation was wrong. Well, I do not know on what possible ground the right hon. Gentleman includes all those points, which are disconnected with each other, in this one vote. The right hon. Gentleman went on to say that everybody here was

bound, if he was anything of a man at all, to vote either for it or against it, and that anyone—and I think he looked in my direction when he made this observation—who declined to vote on so serious a matter as he had considered it to be—no one else said it was—was really unworthy of consideration. I do not think the right hon. Gentleman should be so hard on those who occasionally refrain from voting in a great division. I remember an occasion when the right hon. Gentleman did not vote in a division, although he was the main agent, at any rate, in preparing the debate, on the Indian cotton duties. [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN dissented.] At the time for voting where was the right hon. Gentleman? It is not he, of all men in the House, who ought to speak lightly and unfeelingly of those whose conscience compels them to abstain from voting on either one side or the other. Therefore, I am not disposed at all to take the right hon. Gentleman either as the interpreter of my meaning or conduct or the judge of my action. We are in this position. Coming, as we have come to-day, to discuss, as I hope quietly, this most important matter, coming as I did, I confess, mainly for the purpose of obtaining information from the right hon. Gentleman as to things that are now going on in Cape Colony, of which the people of this country are almost entirely ignorant, of which even those of us who have endeavoured to inform ourselves remain considerably ignorant, we thought that this would be an opportunity at all events for ascertaining something from the right hon. Gentleman, who, as I said the other day, is responsible even on a higher plane, if not in so intense a degree, as the Ministers of Cape Colony for the civil rights of Her Majesty's subjects in that part of the world. But my hon. friend the Member for Cockermouth has moved an Amendment. I will say at once that it occurs to me that my hon. friend takes a very strong view on the whole of this question. He goes to lengths in which I have never been able to accompany him; he has, I believe, again and again, if not always, voted against supplies for the war—that in itself shows how strong a view, how extreme a view, he takes of the war and all its circumstances. I do not agree with him in that extreme view; therefore, I cannot vote with my hon. friend, this being the mode he has adopted of bringing his opinions to book. I cannot vote with my hon. friend, and I will venture to tell him and those who are acting with him that I think they confuse the point considerably by raising a partial motion of this kind. I think that we should be better employed in seriously discussing the events that are happening than in endeavouring to pass a summary judgment in this way, which, as the right hon. Gentleman himself has shown, is capable of being misinterpreted even by so acute a discerner as he is. On the other hand, when I look to see what would be the position if I voted against my hon. friend, I am bound to say I should then apparently be expressing a degree of confidence in the right hon. Gentleman which I am very far from possessing, and in the policy to which from the first I have taken exception in the strongest manner. Therefore, if my hon. friends think it right to go to a division—I hope they will not, especially as it comes on an entirely unprepared House, and was not expected by anyone on this side——

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: There was full notice—three months.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Oh, notices on the Paper. There are always notices on the Paper to reduce the salary of every Secretary of State, but at any rate if my hon. friend goes to a division I shall follow the example of the right hon. Gentleman on the occasion to which I referred—to some extent, at all events—absent myself when the division is taken, and not record a vote on the question. I have said that I do not entertain the degree of confidence in the right hon. Gentleman's policy which would induce me to give a vote in his favour. If the right hon. Gentleman and hon. Gentlemen will cast their minds back to this week last year, I think they will be rather struck by the difference of the position in which we find ourselves. On that occasion—it was the last debate we had before separating for the holidays—the right hon. Gentleman made a most interesting and useful speech, in which he said that he hoped a reciprocal basis to the long controversy as to the franchise grievance was within sight. How completely all the provisions and calculations

of that time and of some months following have been falsified! It is the easiest thing in the world to be wise after the event, but the right hon. Gentlemen who have control of the business of the country must be aware that they are expected to be wise before the event, and that what is harmless ignorance on our part is a want of full performance of duty on theirs. What were the chief errors that they were indulging in this time last year? In the first place, there was the expectation of a peaceful arrangement. That failed. Then there was the idea that the Transvaal would not maintain their case to the point of war. That was proved to be an entire illusion. Then there was the idea that a very moderate increase of our forces would be sufficient. That was an entire miscalculation. And lastly, the last that I will name, there was the idea that the struggle would be sooner over, and that the submission of our enemies would be secured. On each one of these cardinal points the Government have been proved to have been altogether out in their reading of the probabilities of events in South Africa. It amounts to a lamentable and discreditable misjudgment of the facts of the case. For a time the case for the Government was based on the revelation to the country of the great armaments of the Boers, and on the stories that were put about of a conspiracy to drive the British into the sea. That only lasted a short time, however, because although the great armaments of the Boers were unknown to us, to those who had no official means of information, we find that they were known to the Government, who were acquainted with those great armaments. And as to the conspiracy, no proof of it whatever has been to this day adduced, and some of the extremest politicians even in Cape Colony have disclaimed belief in it. That is broadly what has happened since last year. I will put a plain question, and ask, if the consequences that we have seen had been foreseen at that time: if we had known that all this sacrifice of life, suffering, and waste of money, not to speak of other evils that may be in the background, were to follow, is there any man here who would not have gone a great deal further than the right hon. Gentleman showed a disposition to go in order to prevent an open rupture? There is not such a man among us. And can anyone say that the attainment of the ostensible object—namely, the remedy of the Transvaal grievances—was worth all it has cost? No, Sir. That is, no doubt, a thing of the past, but it leads to the position in which we are now. The war is drawing near to a conclusion, slowly, but let us hope certainly, a war which has been from the outset a war of disenchantment. Two things only stand out of which we may well be proud—the constancy and patriotic spirit and equanimity under trial of the British people in this island and throughout the world, and also the bravery of our soldiers. But many of us have never looked upon the war itself, terrible as it is, as the principal calamity; the principal mischief is the condition of things which the war will leave afterwards. I will not repeat for the hundredth time the very admirable sentence in which the right hon. Gentleman predicted the result of a war in South Africa. Someone spoke of it to-day as a hackneyed quotation, and it well deserves that character. As to the state of things after the war, I am not one of those, if there are any, who ever believed that after the war, such as it is, you could put back things as you found them. At the beginning of the session my right hon. friend the Member for East Fife laid down four objects which he thought ought to be kept in view for the end of the war: —(1) that there should be vindicated and established beyond controversy the supremacy of the Imperial power in South Africa; (2) that we should make the recurrence of this catastrophe impossible; (3) that there should be an equality of civil rights; and (4) that there should be no ascendency. In order to show how completely I agreed with my right hon. friend I repeated this formula on a subsequent occasion. Let us look to see how we stand, and whether we are in the way of attaining these objects. I direct special attention to the question of equality of civil rights and no ascendency. Let us consider whether the events now proceeding in Cape Colony are going towards the equality of civil rights and no ascendency. Are we sure that civil rights are being dealt with in such a way as to pacify the fears and give encouragement to all those, whether Dutch or British, who seek to revert to the quiet, peaceable, and harmonious conditions of life from which they were driven and disturbed by recent events? After the war is over, as far as the subjugated States are con-

cerned, I have already stated in an interruption that in my opinion the military occupation must be continued for some time; but that is not in itself an ideal system. I think that the attention of the people of this country should be drawn to the fact that the force to be maintained will be a great burden on the resources of this country, not only in money but in men, and on that ground this is not a matter that only affects the people of South Africa, but it also very closely affects the taxpayers and people of this country. But, leaving for a moment the two States, and coming to Cape Colony, the right hon. Gentleman is mixed up by the appeal made to him from the Cape in the settlement of this matter. The right hon. Gentleman cannot hold himself altogether aloof and irresponsible from all proceedings that have taken place under martial law. I am aware that martial law is administered by military officers, and that the reports on the subject may come to the War Office; but the proper view of martial law was laid down in 1867 in a circular emanating from the Colonial Office when the present Chancellor of the Exchequer was Colonial Minister, and which very clearly shows that it is not to be treated as an absolutely military matter. This circular said, among other things, that it was the plain duty of the Governor to secure that the officers commanded to enforce it should be alike supported and controlled, and that the Governor should issue written directions to the officers in command of troops, that even Her Majesty's Government could not evade the duty of framing standing orders and regulations. The circular also lays down what appears to me to be at variance with what we have heard. It states—

> "The primary object of employing troops under martial law is not the punishment of offences, but the suppression of revolt. Martial law ought not to be enforced beyond the strict limits of the district in which it is proclaimed."

Then it goes on to say that martial law should not be proclaimed over a wider district than the necessities of public safety require, and it should be withdrawn from the whole or part of the district at the earliest moment compatible with public safety. Those were sensible and wholesome regulations, but it appears that the Governor of the colony is responsible for seeing that they are enforced. In a self-governing colony those to whom the Governors are primarily responsible are the Parliament of the colony, and it is not a matter in which we can in one sense directly and in the first instance interfere. I am not making any assertion, because of that state of ignorance in which we have been kept—it may be necessary—that breaches of those regulations have been committed; but there are being circulated reports which do a great deal of mischief among the populations in South Africa, and which it would be well to have contradicted if they can be. This was the object of the many questions addressed to the right hon. Gentleman to which we have received no answer. What is the reason? It may be partly because of that system of censorship about which we shall hear more on Friday, and which has been applied far beyond the range of military facts and communications. In some instances it has gone to the extent of interfering with the expression of political opinion and the conveyance of public and political facts, just in the same way as would be done by the autocratic Government of Russia or the Sultan of Turkey. With regard to those who have been taken up under martial law, what is alleged is this, and I want some explicit answer. It is alleged that a man who is merely suspected of having been favourable to the invaders is looked upon as a rebel. He is apprehended, taken away from his farm and family, put in gaol without trial, not allowed to see a legal adviser or to communicate with his wife, not allowed to take part in any money transactions necessary for his farm; and this state of things goes on apparently indefinitely. I admit that I can give no substantial proof or sworn evidence of those facts having occurred, but there are so many cases reported in the newspapers that I cannot help thinking that some of them do happen. I should like to know from the right hon. Gentleman whether his attention has been called to the circumstance, and what steps he has taken to prevent this horrible scandal being committed under the authority of Her Majesty and the free people of this country. If the people knew that these things were being done under their name they would, I believe,

be filled with indignation. There is another side of this question, and that is the punishment to be inflicted. The right hon. Gentleman has been appealed to by the Cape Ministry to give his views of what ought to be done, but I will not enter on that now, as it has already been referred to. I cannot help saying that in many letters on this subject, even while repudiating anything like vindictiveness, there breathes a certain vindictive spirit in them all. It seems to be an exceedingly delicate duty for us to encourage and interfere on any considerable scale with the disfranchisement of persons in Cape Colony, seeing the great value we attach to those civil rights in this country, and seeing the narrow majority that exists in the Cape Parliament. It has been alleged—I merely mention the fact to be contradicted—I do not allege it—that the actual majority of the Cape Parliament being only half-a-dozen, the arrest of some of those six members under suspicion and put in gaol and not allowed to sit and vote, reduces the majority or turns it into a minority, though this majority will have as its first duty the passing of the Bill to disfranchise the rebels. If that was the result in any degree, I think it would be a most unfortunate circumstance. Then as to the disfranchisement of those who took part with the invaders under compulsion. Surely it is not intended by the right hon. Gentleman and his advisers that disfranchisement should be applied in any wholesale manner to them. I do not wish to put this disfranchisement question too high. If they are to be disfranchised for five years, at the end of the five years the effect of what is now done will be over; and if that is the effect just now, it will redound to the future strengthening of the party who support them.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The right hon. Gentleman seems to forget that this was the proposal of that party whom he says we are going to disfranchise. It was proposed by the Attorney General and Mr. Schreiner.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: But not agreed to by the other party. I do not know what influence was brought to bear in the matter, but there has been a feeling to this effect—"Let us accept this, bad as it is, because the alternative is the suspension of our rights altogether." If there was anything said or done which in the least degree should give occasion for that belief, I think it a most unfortunate circumstance. Why do I dwell on these things? In order to get information in the first place, and also because, if these things are done, the mischief occurs not only in relation to these things in themselves, but in the reflex effect of these things on the action of the whole Dutch population. You say there are things we have done or have not done that have tended to prolong this war—I do not suppose you mean the free granting of supply; we have never failed in that respect, at any rate; but it is not in that sense you mean prolongation of the war—but has there been anything in what we have said more likely to prolong the war than proceedings such as I have mentioned? Every burgher will see that this is the fate in reserve for him, and seeing this he will have the less disposition to yield; he will feel himself in the position of a man with his back to the wall, and therefore he will fight to the bitter end.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: What is the fate the right hon. Gentleman says the burgher will fear?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The fear of being treated with scant respect for his civil rights. They will naturally say—"If this is the boasted regard of Englishmen for civil rights, especially for Parliamentary rights, where shall we be, although they say if we only consent to give up our arms and surrender we shall become colonists and enjoy the full freedom of Englishmen?" That is, I think, a feeling most certainly not desirable to encourage. Therefore I shall be very glad indeed if the right hon. Gentleman can say anything on these points, apart from the question of punishment, and enable an authoritative contradiction to be given to the rumours that are current.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.) and Mr. COURTNEY rose together, and there were cries for both right hon. Gentlemen.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I will not stand between the Committee and the right hon. Gentleman for more than a few minutes, but I must say a word or two of comment upon the strange doctrine of constitutional freedom which the right hon. Gentleman opposite has just promulgated. It will be in the recollection of the Committee that at this time last year and for some months preceding that time we were all anxiously considering the refusal of votes to the Uitlander population of the Transvaal, but I do not remember that the right hon. Gentleman showed himself a protagonist in their cause or anxious to give them the valued liberty of which he now speaks. But when we come to depriving rebels in arms of the franchise for five years, then the right hon. Gentleman is shocked, and describes that as a fate so terrible, that it will not only keep discontent seething in the colony, but will keep the population permanently or for a long period in arms fighting against this country, whereas otherwise they might have been satisfied to accept the inevitable results of unsuccessful warfare. A more amazing doctrine I have never heard presented to this House. The right hon. Gentleman thinks it is an outrage that they should be deprived of the franchise for five years; but does he propose that they should go unpunished, or what alternative does he propose to what he describes as such a terrible fate?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Now, really I do not know why it is I am always so misinterpreted. It was in answer to a question from the right hon. Gentleman opposite who asked "What fate?" I said it was the prospect they apprehended that their civil rights would be dealt with in the way indicated by proceedings said to have taken place—not only disfranchisement, but the whole manner in which suspected persons had been treated, and the administration of the law.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: And culminating, I suppose, in five years disfranchisement. The right hon. Gentleman has quarrelled not so much with the whole procedure as with this most important part of the procedure, and what I think the extremely moderate punishment imposed upon persons who, without the slightest provocation and without any grievance which either they or their friends have ever stated, have deliberately chosen the moment of our difficulties to take up arms against this country. The right hon. Gentleman and others desire that these persons should go unpunished or that some different punishment should be awarded to them. Does he or does he not desire that they should go unpunished? Of course, I have not the right to cross-examine him before the House, or to interpret his silence as meaning assent, and I will not take unfair advantage of the fact that I am speaking and he has spoken; but if the right hon. Gentleman does not mean that these persons should go unpunished, then what punishment does he suggest as an alternative, what punishment more lenient, and which would inflict less suffering on them and their families, than that proposed? He would not, I presume, have the extreme penalty of the law inflicted upon them; he would not desire to see capital punishment inflicted, or that they should undergo imprisonment for life or for a long term of years. Nor, I suppose, would he desire to see any crushing fine imposed upon them. Under these circumstances I fail to see what resource is open to the Government of the Cape, with whom the responsibility rests—although, no doubt, responsibility rests also upon Her Majesty's Government in advising the Cape Government—I do not see what resource is open but to inflict the punishment determined upon, and my own frank opinion is that if the penalty errs at all it is on the side of leniency, not of harshness. I say that in no vindictive spirit, but simply because, seeing that the essence of the object of punishment is to prevent repetition of the offence, it is doubtful whether a punishment so light and so temporary will have the deterrent effect all punishments ought to have. I pass from the right hon. Gentleman's remarks on the policy to be pursued towards the rebels generally to his criticisms upon what has been done to two or three members of the Cape Parliament at the present time. His constitutional soul is shocked at the suggestion that two or three Members of that Parliament, about whose disloyalty I conceive there can be no moral doubt whatever [Hon. MEMBERS: "Oh, oh!" and "Hear, hear!"] —no *moral* doubt whatever, I do not speak of the legal aspect of the case—are

by the fact of their imprisonment deprived of the power of voting in the Cape Parliament, thereby upsetting the balance of power between the two parties there. The right hon. Gentleman seems to be deeply shocked at that; but may I remind him that the balance of parties in that Parliament is disturbed by another very different cause, upon which he has raised no protest. Some Members of that Parliament who do not share the views of those who are imprisoned are now fighting at the front, risking their lives in the defence of that Empire of which their country forms a part. Their party is deprived of their Parliamentary services, the balance of power is disturbed by their absence, and I should have thought that that, at all events, would have affected the right hon. Gentleman much more than the absence from their places of men who under any circumstances must be admitted to be under the darkest suspicion—to use the mildest language—as to their views and attitude towards the country to which they belong. I do not know that I need say more on the latter part of the speech of the right hon. Gentleman, but I must say a word on the earlier part of that speech, when he was engaged in the—I think not uncongenial and certainly not unfamiliar—task of explaining to the Committee why he is not going to give a vote. But I really find it difficult to follow his reasons for that course. He criticised my right hon. friend for assuming that the issue raised by the Amendment now before the Committee was the general policy of the war and the annexation of the two Republics. Well, I think we have full justification for that assumption, for every single speaker who has addressed the Committee from the other side of the House and belongs to the right hon. Gentleman's party, has made the war the sole text of his speech, and directed his criticism to the policy of the war and of annexation. And another hon. Gentleman, who is a loyal supporter of the right hon. Gentleman, has risen more than once with a desire to emphasise the same views. The hon. Baronet the Member for Cockermouth, who is no longer in his place, the hon. and learned Member for Dumfries, the hon. Member for Northampton, the hon. Member for Carnarvon—all have taken precisely the same view of the issue before the Committee, and which to-morrow will be before the country as that which my right hon. friend has given expression to. I do not wish to enter into controversy with the hon. Gentleman opposite, whose speech in point of form was excellent, but in point of substance and matter it was a direct attack on the announcement which my right hon. friend made on behalf of the Government as the policy we are going to pursue. Let me remind the right hon. Gentleman that when my right hon. friend was repeating to the Committee what was the issue, and putting in the plainest language what it was that those who voted for the Amendment would be supporting, and what it was that those who voted with the Government would be supporting, he was cheered, loudly cheered, by the gentlemen sitting behind the right hon. Gentleman opposite and below the Gangway on the other side. They will not deny that. [HON MEMBERS: No, no.] I am sure they will not; their assent was expressed in the most emphatic inarticulate form. Therefore my right hon. friend was amply justified in thinking that the right hon. Gentleman is standing alone in imagining that the issue before us is something more than the powers of prophecy Her Majesty's Government may or may not have shown during the last twelve months. Then the right hon. Gentleman said, taking up a phrase of my right hon. friend, that the country does not know the policy of the Government, but does know the policy of the Opposition. Well, I thought that an amazing statement to make. It almost passes the limits——

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I used the observation as quoting a case in which I had been more explicit than the right hon. Gentleman.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes; I think the point upon w hich the right hon. Gentleman was more explicit than my right hon. friend was as to the exact form of provisional administration which should be adopted in the Transvaal and the Orange Free State. The right hon. Gentleman forgets that a very large fraction of his party do not wish any provisional form of government either in the Free State or in the Transvaal, and do not want these countries to be annexed. The right hon. Gentleman has a perfect right to speak for himself,

and, I presume, for all the members of that bench, except the right hon. Gentleman who sits at the end of it (Mr. John Morley) and the hon. and learned Gentleman who sits next to him (Sir R. Reid).

SIR ROBERT REID: My right hon. friend the Member for Stirling is my Leader, and in my opinion the only Leader of the Liberal party.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: That statement, made in the enthusiasm of passion, seems to me to be directed more against people who are not leaders than the distinguished Gentleman who is Leader; but I cannot congratulate the right hon. Gentleman as Leader upon the obedience of one of his principal followers. For, while the right hon. Gentleman will not vote for this Amendment, the hon. and learned Gentleman got up and concluded his admirable oration by saying that he felt bound by all that he held sacred and dear to vote for the Amendment of the hon. Member for Poplar. That is a very curious course to take, in face of his passionate declaration of attachment to his Leader. But I have performed the only duty that is necessary in reference to the first part of the right hon. Gentleman's speech when I have reminded him and shown to the Committee that, when the right hon. Gentleman says he has got a clear and definite policy, that is not the policy of the party which he leads, and that whatever demerits there may be in the policy expressed by my right hon. friend, this merit it at all events has, that it commands the undoubted and loyal support of, I think, with the exception of my right hon. friend (Mr. Courtney), the whole of the Unionist party, and, I believe, the vast majority of the country. So important do I hold it that not the people of this country, or even the people of Europe alone, but our fellow-countrymen in South Africa, in this war, on one side or the other, should know that we speak with no uncertain voice in this matter, and are supported in no uncertain way by the country, that I earnestly trust, in spite of the defection of the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Courtney), the House will show quite clearly on which side its true opinion lies.

MR. COURTNEY: This is avowedly the last occasion this session, and, it is said by many, the last time in this Parliament, on which any issue can be taken on the colonial policy in South Africa of Her Majesty's Government. And although some, no doubt—perhaps a large majority of Members—may return to next Parliament to continne to take part in this discussion, that may not be given to every one of us, and those who have anything to say now had better take the opportunity, even at the penalty of being silenced for ever afterwards. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Stirling Burghs commands my sympathy, approaching almost to commiseration. He is one of that class of men who are said to excite the pity of God—"a good man struggling with adversity"—and, in the position in which he is placed, I am not disposed to contest the propriety of the action which he, as the leader of a mixed party, proposes to take. It has been pointed out that members of the party behind him, quite apart from the obedience ordinarily paid to a leader, may in the present situation, without disrespect to him, exercise their own judgment as to what they will do. I at all events have no hesitation as to my vote and as to the meaning of my vote on this occasion. I shall certainly vote for the Amendment, because I look upon the Colonial Secretary as mainly responsible for the great error of this war, and also as mainly responsible for the great error of policy with which avowedly Her Majesty's Government appear to be about to crown the war. It is upon him the glory—if it be a glory—and the responsibility of this war rest; upon him, as Colonial Secretary, most of all rests the burden of meeting the House of Commons on the question of the policy which is to follow the war. And this is the occasion on which we are to express our opinion as to that policy. The Colonial Secretary, I frankly avow, has, in my judgment, misunderstood the problem in South Africa from the first. If that seems a bold and impudent assertion, I ask hon. Members to reflect on the position we were in twelve months ago. Can anyone who realises the position even then, and the attitude of the right hon. Gentleman then, and sees what has happened since—how the drama in South Africa has unfolded itself and the issues have been presented—can anyone resist the conclusion that he misunderstood it

last year? He says he has changed his opinion on some things. It seems to me it is want of comprehension—it is an intellectual question as much as a moral one—of the elements of the problem in South Africa which prevented his forming a sound judgment last year, and which is preventing his forming a sound judgment now. Take the question of the treatment of "avowed rebels," so called. The Leader of the House spoke of this question as involving the treatment of avowed rebels who had no extenuation to offer for the fact of open rebellion. Now look at the six classes of offenders. The last of all were those who were forced into the rebellion by a coercion which overpowered them, and the last but one dealt with those who, under the constraint of the invading forces of the enemy, furnished them with the supplies they wanted when commandeered. Can these two classes be spoken of as men in open rebellion without any extenuating circumstances? With respect to these two classes such language is extremely inappropriate. Here the charge against the Colonial Secretary is that he, not by direct veto, but practically, overpowered the spontaneous proposal of the Ministers of the Crown at the Cape. The Ministers of the Crown at the Cape knew the circumstances of the Cape, yet their policy with respect to the treatment of those different classes of persons was in effect declared to be inacceptable. The Colonial Secretary makes a statement in this connection which I find it hard to justify. He says the leader of the Government out there changed his opinion and deferred to the opinion at home. I can discover no statement justifying that assertion. It is quite true that, after receiving the expression of opinion from home, he communicated, in concert with the Attorney General, a modified proposal for the five years disfranchisement, but he never said he thought it was better than the first proposal. The Colonial Secretary in Downing Street thinks his own opinion wiser than that of the Ministers at the Cape on the spot as to how to deal with those rebels. Does the new Ministry at the Cape take up the position of the Colonial Secretary? I understand to-day from the Colonial Secretary that the Cape Minister has taken up a proposal for five years disfranchisement. That was not the proposal of the Colonial Secretary. His proposal was a disfranchisement for life, so we find him really more exacting even than Sir Gordon Sprigg and his colleagues in the present Government. I wish I could make the Members of this House understand in some degree what the position of these unfortunate rebels was on the border of Cape Colony. Cape Colony, in its interior, as is well known, is inhabited almost mainly by Dutch, whose families spread over into the adjacent Free State and still further afield into the Transvaal, establishing, in fact, a brotherhood between the society on the one side and the society on the other. These men when the war broke out were filled with a conviction that the war was an unjust one—that it was forced on the people of the Transvaal and the Free State by the action of our Government at home. It is not necessary at this moment to express an opinion upon that issue. But if these people felt that the war was an unjust one, forced upon those immediately over the frontier by the action of the Government at home, and knew that among those called upon and forced to fight on the other side were their brothers, their nephews, and their cousins, all the male representatives in every degree, is it to be wondered at that they should be overpowered by the sense of brotherhood, and in some cases should have carried their indignation against what they considered to be the provocative action of the Government at home to the length of joining the insurgents? But the majority did not join, they remained quiet. When they gave in they were treated as people in occupation of the country under the control of the new Government, and they were bound to obey the *de facto* Government in all lawful things, but they were not, of course, bound to bear arms against their own country; and because they, being in this position, gave supplies to the enemy, they are to be treated in the fashion described. To treat these men with undue severity is to create a standing sore upon the border itself, and to inflame the minds of the loyal Dutch in the rest of Cape Colony. It is because the right hon. Gentleman has shown that failure of understanding, that want of sympathy, I am afraid it is, which prevents his realising the actual conditions of life in the country with which he has to deal, that he has fallen into error. He spoke of the loyal Dutch What he meant by

the loyal Dutch was the Dutch who approved of the policy of Her Majesty's Government, as if a man could not be a loyal Dutchman who disapproved of the policy of Her Majesty's Government. Can a man be a loyal Englishman who disapproves of the policy of Her Majesty's Government? Is that impossible? Am I disloyal because I disapprove of the policy of Her Majesty's Government? It is said that I am unpatriotic. I think the tests of patriotism will survive these judgments. The notion that loyalty means support of Her Majesty's Government is one of those things I am not surprised at in the right. hon. and gallant Gentleman below me, because it is entirely consistent with the past policy of the Government of Ireland, but it is not in the least compatible with the idea of the freedom of the citizen in a free country. The Dutchmen who are opposed to the policy of Her Majesty's Government, and are yet loyal, are numbered by tens of thousands, and you are alienating them—the most precious part of your colony, the part without whom you cannot go on and continue your present government—you are alienating them by the policy you pursue. What is the significant language of Lord James of Hereford? Speaking of the future, and describing what many of us hoped would have come about—and might have come about but for the wretched experience of recent years—the establishment of one union of States throughout South Africa, he said that the loyal must be supported in their predominance over the disloyal, and, if necessary, the Constitution must be suspended in order to carry out that. That is to say that the Constitution of Cape Colony, in order to allow the supporters of Her Majesty's Government in Cape Colony to lord it over those who are not supporters, must be suspended. The prospect in Cape Colony itself is one of the darkest. If we carry on our view from there to the Free State and the Transvaal, what is the prospect you have before you there—with your annexation and your consequent action? Among other things with which I charge the Colonial Secretary, I say that he has brought upon us a war which has not only won us no glory, but has brought us great shame. It may be quite true that the consideration of the cost of the war has no logical connection with its policy. We may well qualify our judgment of the policy of this war when we remember what its history has been and what kind of credit it has brought to our military glory. I see that Mr. Winston Churchill seems to have inherited that courage which distinguished his father, and without which there can be no perception and no statement of truth. He says that now that he has come back, having once said that one Boer was equal, in the conditions of fighting in South Africa, to four Englishman or four Englishmen and a fraction, he is now disposed to say that he understated the case, and that he is more than equal to four, five, or even six. Now I will pass on to the future and the annexation. We are to have military occupation of these States when they are captured—when they are subdued—followed after a short interval by the institution of a Crown colony. I agree with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Stirling Burghs in preferring that the military occupation should be kept up without a transition stage. A military occupation is essentially and in the nature of things a provisional arrangement, and consequently forces itself on your judgment for revision and improvement, whereas if you establish a Crown colony you may have that form for many more years than you calculated. Let your military organisation remain until you find, if you ever do find, the opportunity of giving free institutions to the States. Then what is the prospect? We look back to 1877–1880. In 1877 the Transvaal was annexed in peace, without armed conflict, with the consent of the then President, and with the consent of many others, and yet at the end of three years we had to restore it after war. Among those concerned in the government of the Transvaal besides Sir Owen Lanyon was Sir Bartle Frere, the High Commissioner, who was the equal in experience, and perhaps in force of mind, to Sir Alfred Milner. Lord Wolseley was concerned in the government of the Transvaal, and Sir George Colley had something to do with the government. When I compare these men with Sir Alfred Milner and the officers who have been acting under Lord Roberts, and from whom it may be presumed that the military commissioners will be chosen for administering the annexed States, I do not see what guarantee we have that we shall not go through the same experience in the future as we have done in the past.

You cannot give these two communities the franchise as long as you are exacting the tribute and imposing the taxes necessary to pay the war indemnity, because you could not get them to agree to it. As to getting a united peaceable South Africa such as you have got in Australia, such as you have got in Canada, by these methods, you cannot do it. It might have been got in the other way. It may be asked, what is the alternative? I admit it is a very serious question. You cannot put back things. The right hon. Gentleman says you cannot put back things at the end of an experience such as we have been going through exactly as they were before. I admit it. My hon. friend the Member for Durham made an able and considerate speech in the early part of the afternoon, in which he dwelt on the unwisdom of not facing the facts. I agree that it would be unwise not to face the facts in relation to the Transvaal; but what is the difficulty which prevents the reconstruction of these states with a greater or less degree of freedom, involving disarmament, involving, it may be, a partial reorganisation of the Rand, but leaving on the whole a substantially free Government to the Free State, and to the pastoral portion, at least, of the Transvaal? Could you not do it by the presence of a Resident who would have authority such as you have seen exercised in an Indian State? What is the difficulty? Is the difficulty in South Africa, or is it here? What is the difficulty that prevents our accepting and aiming at that solution? I do not say that in the circumstances it is certain to succeed. A man would be rash and foolish after this year of warfare to speak of anything as being certain to succeed. You will have need of the best head and the best heart you can send out to South Africa to grapple with the problems before you. But the difficulty is not there. I do not know how many Members of this House read the draft letter from President Kruger which appeared in the last Blue-book but one. Let anyone in the House or the country who has not read that letter read it. The difficulty is not in South Africa; if we had the temper at home that was shown there, the solution would be easy. It is a question of temper, not a question of facts which cannot be dealt with, with which you have to deal. Is the colonial policy of this nation towards the States and colonies all over the world to be settled for ever with the issue of the coming election? No, Sir. The inevitability of annexation does not arise from annexation being just or right. Men who admit that annexation is wrong still say it is inevitable, because the British people are determined upon it. But it is a patriot's part, when he sees a policy being adopted which he thinks is wrong now and full of injury for the future, to say so, and try to alter the temper of the British people. [Laughter.] Hon. Members laugh, but the temper of the British people altered in the late seventies and the early eighties, and the temper of the British people will, if I mistake not, be transformed during the years of the next Parliament. We are not going to settle this South African business by the action we are taking to-day. To quote that often-quoted speech of the Colonial Secretary, it will rest with you with its rankling injuries for years. That story will come home from South Africa, and during the next Parliament the Front Opposition Bench will continually be educated in that story. They will learn what it means, they will discover its significance, and their friends in the country, and even the newspapers, after a time, will learn some scintilla of the elements of the problem of which at present they are entirely ignorant. I have only one other observation to make. This is the first time in the history of the dealings with troubles of this kind that we have had the spectacle of rulers less wise than those who are ruled. Often before there have been rebellions, domestic troubles, insurrections, disasters, and, after a period more or less prolonged, things have been put right and the presiding ruler, when they have been put right, has had to recognise that unless you get a certain agreement in mind and temper among the bulk of those ruled you cannot go on, however favourable may be the initial moment of your resuming power. So they have always been, in the past, extremely chary of punishing, and have been most reluctant to put a penalty upon those whom they have subdued. In the great American revolution we know that President Johnson was wiser than those around him, and escaped by only one vote being impeached for a policy which everyone now recognises was right. There is

a phrase which has passed into politics, which in this case is significant. One has read in history of persons *plus royalistes que le roi.* That King was Louis XVIII., of whom it is said that he never learnt anything and never forgot anything. But he was wiser than his Royalists, for these proscriptions he would not sanction. When I recall what has happened in Cape Colony, and see that the policy of the Colonial Secretary is not only more severe than that of Mr. Schreiner, but also of Sir Gordon Sprigg, I think I can say with justice, *plus royaliste que le roi.*

SIR EDWARD GREY (Northumberland, Berwick): I trust the House will, for a short time, give me its indulgence, and I will endeavour to confine myself as much as possible to a statement of opinion rather than of argument. I do so the more easily because I had not intended to take any part in the debate. But the hon. and learned Member for Dumfries and the Leader of the Government have both made speeches which render it necessary that some personal explanation should be given. I cannot give to the statement of my own individual position that same force and form which my hon. and learned friend has given to his statement of opinion, but I shall try to do it with the same loyalty and consideration for the leader whom we are both anxious to follow. I am going to take a course which differs from the Leader of the Opposition. I am going to vote against the Amendment. I wish to say that, with the respect I have for him personally, I desire to be in agreement with him, and I differ from him with reluctance. But, at the same time, I feel that as my right hon. friend is not going to vote for the Amendment, it gives, and must necessarily give, a certain liberty of action to those among his followers who hold strong opinions to take their own course. No one can doubt, after taking note of the quarter from which the Amendment comes, what it means. What it does and must always mean can only be gathered from those who supported it, and if anything were wanted to clinch what it means it is the eloquent speech of the right hon. Member for Bodmin, who never intervenes in debate without raising the tone of debate and expressing his views with eloquence. He has stated distinctly that this Amendment raises the whole question of the merits of the war. I prefer to say "the merits" rather than the policy of the war, because I do not think there was any war policy in this country whatever. The strongest point against the Government is that they were taken by surprise and had not made enough preparation. The preparation was on the other side. The policy was on the other side. The policy was Mr. Kruger's, pursued, as I believe after what has come to light, for a long course of years. The want of policy was at home. The Government, or rather some members of it, make it difficult for us to support them, because they endeavour to say that if we support them with regard to the merits of the war, if we do not hold them responsible for having brought about the war, we are bound to refrain from criticism of mistakes which have been made in the conduct of the war. That is the only construction I can put on the extract from the speech of Lord James of Hereford the other day which my hon. and learned friend has quoted. If that was not what Lord James intended, I do not know what he did mean. I say frankly that we do not consider that by this Vote we are bound to abstain from criticisms of mistakes or of the whole question of who was responsible for the "unhappy entanglement at Ladysmith," for the want of preparation, and what seems to us apparent, the want of a guiding, directing spirit co-ordinating the policy of the Cabinet as a whole. Upon such points we cannot keep silence, and it must not be understood that we are going to keep silence upon them. I make that guarded statement because I gather it is designed to put a certain construction upon this vote. The construction I put upon the vote is this: As far as this vote is concerned, it does not deal with the general merits of the war, but it deals with what has been disclosed in the Papers last presented to Parliament—the punishment of the rebels. Lord James of Hereford appears to have made a speech going far beyond anything which appears in the Blue-book, but it is not his speech that we are discussing. The actual proposals in the Blue-book are quite definite. To attempt to maintain disfranchisement in perpetuity might land you in the position of having a Government the nominal representative of the country, but really representative of the

minority, and that would be certain to produce demoralisation of the Government in the long run, and perpetuate exasperation in the country. But when it comes to a question of five years disfranchisement and the other penalties which are proposed in the Blue-book, I cannot say that the penalties are excessive. Clemencies in the past were directed against wholesale executions and irreparable penalties which, once enforced, could never be undone. There is no irreparable penalty proposed here, and there is nothing that cannot be easily removed in the future. Taking the proposals as they stand, I do not think they are excessive. We must bear in mind that the loyalists have also to be considered. We have as yet made no reparation to them, and we are not in a position to do so. Starting, then, from the point that no irreparable penalties are proposed, I think that it will be sufficient that we should accept this as reasonable for the moment, but bear in mind that, if we wish to be more lenient in the future, that will be more effective on the whole state of public opinion in South Africa when we have made some reparation to the loyalists. So much on that particular point. Now, Sir, with regard to the merits of the war. I am really bound by the opinions which I have expressed in the country and the vote I gave last October to vote against the Amendment. This Amendment is in substance the same Amendment. What I think is important is that the Government should have a clear understanding, and that it should be known how far we are prepared to go in giving them support in the future. When we stated at the beginning of the session that we should support the Government in carrying on the war, the Leader of the House said the value of that depended on how far we would go. For myself I support them to the end of the war, and in proclaiming annexation afterwards. If you do not have annexation—if you do not have a clear issue with regard to annexation—you will have again Conventions, and you will have again that weary treadmill of which we have had experience, and the whole country kept in a state of unrest. Although I am anxious that we should advocate what we think necessary, reasonable, moderate, and in a fair temper, we must remember how far the lessons of the past show that the earnest and conciliatory temper as expressed by the Member for Bodmin runs the risk of being misunderstood in South Africa, and how it has been misunderstood. Let us be perfectly clear on the point of annexation. Annexation seems to me to be synonymous with the end of the war. When the war comes to an end annexation must follow, but we all feel that it is as easy to annex as it is to end the war. We can annex with a mere stroke of the pen. The Government have a right to ask as to the future what support they will have in making a settlement after the annexation has been accomplished. That is a matter which it is impossible to discuss before the end of the war. But, while I am entirely uncommitted with regard to the settlement, I feel, as I suppose everybody feels, that in the long run it is impossible for any large number of white men to be kept within the British Empire without representative Government. What should be the first steps, and how soon they should be taken, must depend upon the condition of affairs with which we have to deal after the war is over. We have had many prophecies, some pessimistic and some optimistic, as to the condition of affairs, but I would not take the opinion of anyone, however well he knows South Africa, as to what the condition of affairs will be, certainly not of persons who have been spending their time in this country while events have been in progress in South Africa. What we shall want is a long, careful, and exhaustive opinion from those in South Africa who have been through the war and who have held responsible positions and are really representative men. When the Government are in a position to give us that, we shall be in a position to discuss the question of settlement. I hope I have made my position clear on this Vote. Having stated, as I have, that, though I deplore the mistakes which have been made in the conduct of the war, and the want of preparation, I have believed throughout that this country has been in the right and that the war has been forced upon it. Under these circumstances I see no reason why I should not repeat the vote I gave last October.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): I do not intend to detain the House, because I am anxious to bring this sitting to an end.

I had not intended either to speak or to vote upon this Amendment, but the speech just delivered by my hon. friend has made it absolutely necessary that some of us should say what we think of the position. To my mind this Amendment, which I treat entirely apart from the speeches which have been made in support of it, does not express any opinion as to what the settlement is to be after the war, but it is an expression of strong disapproval and distrust of the methods recently adopted by the Government, and in particular of the attitude of the Colonial Secretary. I will not argue now the merits of the war with my hon. friend beside me. It would be a thankless task to argue with him, but I will repeat what I have said before of this war, that I believe it to be a needless war, and one which leaves us worse off in South Africa as regards the future than we were before. Now, I desire to say a word or two as to what has arisen in the course of this debate. I agree with my hon. friend the Member for the Berwick Division—and I am afraid it is almost the only point on which I do agree with him in the speech he has made—that this is not the time to talk of a settlement, and if my hon. friend feels that it is too soon to ask for the plan of a settlement I think he would have been well advised if he had also abstained from expressing any opinion upon the question of annexation. Public opinion is far too excited, as well as too imperfectly informed, in England at the present time to enable us to deal properly with this question. The justification which I find for the submitting of this Amendment is because it is aimed at the present attitude and the recent policy of Her Majesty's Government. That is a policy which is permeated by a spirit which is utterly wrong and foolish. There was not a word in the speech made by the right hon. Gentleman the Colonial Secretary tending to pacify public feeling in South Africa. The difficulties there are enormous. The difficulties of bringing about peace and good feeling there will tax the wisdom of statesmen for generations to come, and yet the right hon. Gentleman never said a word calculated to make those difficulties less. Whenever he delivers a speech, he makes them greater. When offers of peace were made to the Government, some months ago, those offers were met by a peremptory refusal which cut off all possibility of negotiations, and that decisive refusal has done much to prolong the war. The Government proclaimed the annexation of the Free State before it was necessary to do so, and when they told the Free State burghers and the Transvaal burghers that no better terms would be granted them if they desisted from fighting, they gave them every encouragement to fight on to the end. The right hon. Gentleman ignores the existence of the large mass of well-disposed and loyal Dutch people to whom we have to look in the future if we are to hope to retain Cape Colony in contentment. This is not a question of inflicting punishment on the ringleaders in the rebellion, but it is a question of disfranchising those who may not have done a single disloyal act in districts which the British troops were not protecting. These men ought not to be punished by lifelong disfranchisement, as the Colonial Secretary proposed, because it is plain that they acted under compulsion. I confess that I feel that there must be a punishment for the rebels, and I also feel that we cannot restore the republics to the same state in which they were in before the war. Both these things we must admit, but what I also feel is that there is a great need in a country like South Africa that words of peace should be spoken, that punishment should go no further than is absolutely necessary, and should have no vindictive character, and that when passion runs so high in South Africa there should come from England words to show that we were trying to look at things in a much calmer and wiser spirit, and words that would make for peace and conciliation. Like my hon. friend the Member for the Berwick Division, we all desire a united and peaceful South Africa, but the policy of the Government appears to be calculated to stir up and perpetuate strife between the white races in the presence of a vast black population, which the more it increases and the more it assimilates the arts of civilisation, will so much the more become a most formidable element in the country. In the face of these difficulties we have a right to expect that the Government should try to pour oil upon the troubled waters instead of aggrava-

ting the difficulties that exist, and making it harder to restore that peace which South Africa so sadly needs. Under these circumstances I feel bound to join in the condemnation of the recent policy of the Government, which is conveyed by the Amendment.

MR. LUTTRELL (Devonshire, Tavistock) rose to continue the debate, when—

MR. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 169; Noes, 100. (Division List No. 241.)

AYES.

Allsopp, Hon. George
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Barnes, Frederic Gorell
Bartley, George, C. T.
Beach, Rt Hn Sir. M. H. (Bristol)
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brown, Alexander H.
Bullard, Sir Harry
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Hertford, E.)
Cecil, Lord H. (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, J. A. (Worc'r)
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Charrington, Spencer
Chelsea, Viscount
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, C. E. H. Athole
Cook, Fred. Lucas (Lambeth)
Cooke, C. W. Radcliffe (Heref'd)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Curzon, Viscount
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Drage, Geoffrey
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, George Denison
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.
Fergusson, Rt. Hn Sir J (Manc'r
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitz Wygram, General Sir F.
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Gedge, Sydney
Gibbons, J. Lloyd
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H. (City of Lond
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir J. Eldon
Goschen, George J. (Sussex)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Green, W. D. (Wednesbury)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Gull, Sir Cameron
Halsey, Thomas Frederick
Hamilton, Rt. Hon. Lord G.
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robert W.
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Henderson, Alexander
Hoare, Edw Brodie (Hampstead
Hoare, Sir Samuel (Norwich)
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, R. P.
Howard, Joseph
Howell, William Tudor
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Jackson, Rt. Hon. Wm. Lawies
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Lawrence, W. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks.)
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leighton, Stanley
Llewelyn, Sir Dillwyn-(S'wns'a
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lopes, Henry Yarde Buller
Lowe, Francis William
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macartney, W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinb'gh, W.
Manners, Lord Edward Wm. J.
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, Rt Hon. Sir Herbert E
Mellor, Colonel (Lancashire)
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore, John Thr'gmorton
Milward, Colonel Victor
Monk, Charles James
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, R. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, Hon. F. (Monm'thsh.
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. A (Deptford)
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Nicol, Donald Ninian
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Parkes, Ebenezer
Penn, John
Percy, Earl
Philipotts, Captain Arthur
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plunkett, Rt. Hn. H. Curzon
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Remnant, James Farquharson
Richardson, Sir T. (Hartlep'l)
Ridley, Rt Hon Sir Matthew W.
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. T.
Russell, T. W. (Tyrone)
Saunderson, Rt Hn. Col. Edw. J.
Savory, Sir Joseph
Scoble, Sir Andrew Richard
Seely, Charles Hilton
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spencer, Ernest
Stanley, Edw. Jas. (Somerset)
Stanley, Sir Henry M (Lambeth
Stephens, Henry Charles
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Rt. Hn JG (Oxf'd Univ.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E. (Kent)
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Welby, Lt.-Col ACE (Taunton)
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-under-L.
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, George
Wyvill, Marmaduke D'Arcy

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Sir William Walrond and
Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allison, Robert Andrew
Austin, M. (Limerick, W.)
Baker, Sir John
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bethell, Commander
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Augustine
Blake, Edward
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Clark, Dr. G. B.
Courtney, Rt. Hn. Leonard H.
Crilly, Daniel
Crombie, John William
Curran, Thomas B. (Donegal)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Duckworth, James
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir Francis H (South'ton
Fenwick, Charles
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Fox, Dr. Joseph Francis
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gourley, Sir Edward Temperley
Grey, Sir Edward (Berwick)
Gurdon, Sir William Brampton
Haldane, Richard Burdon
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Healy, Maurice (Cork)
Healy, Timothy M. (N. Louth)
Hedderwick, Thomas C. H.
Holland, William Henry
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jones, David B. (Swansea)
Kearley, Hudson E.
Labouchere, Henry
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macaleese, Daniel
MacDonnell, Dr. M. A. (Qn's. C.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
M'Hugh, Patrick A. (Leitrim)
M'Leod, John
Maddison, Fred.
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Mellor, Rt. Hon. J. W. (Yorks.)
Mendl, Sigismund Ferdinand
Molloy, Bernard Charles
Morley, Rt. Hon John (Montr'se
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Oldroyd, Mark
O'Malley, William
Paulton, James Mellor
Perks, Robert William
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pilkington, Sir G. A. (Lancs SW
Power, Patrick Joseph
Reid, Sir Robert Threshie
Rickett, J. Compton
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Samuel, J. (Stockton-on-Tees)
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Shaw, Charles Ed. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick, B.)
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Albert
Stanhope, Hon. Philip J.
Steadman, William Charles
Strachey, Edward
Stuart, James (Shoreditch)
Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)
Tanner, Charles Kearns
Tennant, Harold John
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene
Wedderburn, Sir William
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Charles Henry (Hull)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Herbert Gladstone and
Mr. M'Arthur.

Question put accordingly.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 52; Noes, 208. (Division List No. 242.)

AYES.

Allison, Robert Andrew
Austin, M. (Limerick, W.)
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Blake, Edward
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Clark. Dr. G. B.
Courtney, Rt. Hon. Leonard H.
Crilly, Daniel
Curran, Thomas B. (Donegal)
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Duckworth, James
Fenwick, Charles
Fox, Dr. Joseph Francis
Gurdon, Sir William Brampton
Hayden, John Patrick
Healy, Maurice (Cork)
Healy, Timothy M. (N. Louth)
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Labouchere, Henry
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macaleese, Daniel
MacDonnell, Dr M A (Queen's C
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
M'Hugh, Patrick A. (Leitrim)
M'Leod, John
Maddison, Fred.
Molloy, Bernard Charles
Morley, Rt Hon John (Montrose
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Dowd, John
O'Malley, William
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Power, Patrick Joseph
Reid, Sir Robert Threshie
Samuel, J. (Stockton-on-Tees)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Stanhope, Hon. Philip J.
Steadman, William Charles
Sullivan, Donald (Westmeath)
Tanner, Charles Kearns
Wedderburn, Sir William
Wilson, Charles Henry (Hull)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Mr. Channing and Mr.
Scott.

NOES.

Allsopp, Hon. George
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Baker, Sir John
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Barnes, Frederic Gorell
Bartley, George C. T.
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H (Bristol)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bill, Charles
Birrell, Augustine
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Bond, Edward
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brown, Alexander H.
Bullard, Sir Harry
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbys.
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Hertford, East)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J (Birm.
Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry

Charrington, Spencer
Chelsea, Viscount
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Fred. Lucas (Lambeth)
Cooke, C. W. Radcliffe (Heref'd)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edwd. Bainbridge
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Crombie, John William
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Curzon, Viscount
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan)
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir Wm. Theodore
Drage, Geoffrey
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir Francis H (South'ton
Faber, George Denison
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hn. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn Sir J (Manch'r
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitz Wygram, General Sir F.
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Gedge, Sydney
Gibbons, J. Lloyd
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H (City of Lond.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, George J. (Sussex)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gourley, Sir Edward Temperley
Green, Walford D. (Wedn'sb'ry
Greene, H. D. (Shrewsbury)
Grey, Sir Edward (Berwick)
Gull, Sir Cameron
Haldane, Richard Burdon
Halsey, Thomas Frederick
Hamilton, Rt. Hon. Lord Geo.
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robt. Wm.
Harwood, George
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hedderwick, Thomas Chas. H.
Henderson, Alexander
Hoare, E. Brodie (Hampstead)
Hoare, Sir Samuel (Norwich)
Holland, William Henry
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, R. P.
Howard, Joseph
Howell, William Tudor
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Jackson, Rt. Hon. Wm. Lawies
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Jones, David Brynmor (Swans'a
Kearley, Hudson E.
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Langley, Batty
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks.)
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leighton, Stanley
Llewelyn, Sir Dillwyn- (Sw'ns'a
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lopes, Henry Yarde Buller
Lowe, Francis William
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macartney, W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall
M'Iver, Sir L. (Edinburgh, W.
Manners, Lord Edward Wm. J
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Massey-Mainwaring, Hon. W F
Maxwell, Rt. Hon. Sir Herbert E
Mellor, Colonel (Lancashire)
Mellor, Rt. Hon. J. W. (Yorks.)
Mendl, Sigismund Ferdinand
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore, John T.
Milward, Colonel Victor
Monk, Charles James
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, R. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, Hon. F. (Monm'thsh.)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. A (Deptford)
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Oldroyd, Mark
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Parkes, Ebenezer
Paulton, James Mellor
Penn, John
Percy, Earl
Perks, Robert William
Phillpotts, Captain Arthur
Pilkington, Sir G. A. (Lancs S W
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plunkett, Rt Hn Horace Curzon
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Remnant, James Farquharson
Richardson, Sir T. (Hartlep'l
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridley, Rt. Hon. Sir Matthew W
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Robson, William Snowdon
Russell, T. W. (Tyrone)
Saunderson, Rt Hn. Col. Edw. J.
Savory, Sir Joseph
Scoble, Sir Andrew Richard
Seely, Charles Hilton
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spencer, Ernest
Spicer, Albert
Stanley, Edward J. (Somerset)
Stanley, Sir Henry M (Lambeth
Stephens, Henry Charles
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strachey, Edward
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Rt. Hon J G (Oxf'd Univ.
Tennant, Harold John
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, W. E. Murray
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Ure, Alexander
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warde, Lt.-Col. C. E. (Kent)
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Wason, Eugene
Welby, Lt.-Col. A C E (Taunt'n)
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-under-L
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt Hn E. R. (Bath)
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, George
Wyvill, Marmaduke D'Arcy

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR claimed, "That the Original Question be now put."

Original Question put accordingly.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 176; Noes, 41. (Division List No. 243.)

AYES.

Allsopp, Hon. George
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Baker, Sir John
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, R. t Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Barnes, Frederic Gorell
Bartley, George C. T.
Beach, Rt. Hn Sir M. H. (Bristol)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn)
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brown, Alexander H.
Bullard, Sir Harry
Butcher, John George
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbys.)
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Hertford, East)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J (Birm.

Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Charrington, Spencer
Chelsea, Viscount
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colstone, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Fred. Lucas (Lambeth)
Cooke, C. W. Radcliffe (Here'd)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Cox, Irwin Edw. Bainbridge
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Curzon, Viscount
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Drage, Geoffrey
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, George Denison
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Man'r
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
FitzWygram, General Sir F.
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Gedge, Sydney
Gibbons, J. Lloyd
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H. (City of Lond.)
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir J. Eldon
Goschen, George J. (Sussex)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gourley, Sir Edward Temperley
Green, Walford D (Wednesbury
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Gull, Sir Cameron
Halsey, Thomas Frederick
Hamilton, Rt. Hon. Lord G.
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Henderson, Alexander
Hoare, E. Brodie (Hampstead)
Hoare, Sir Samuel (Norwich)
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, R. P.
Howard, Joseph
Howell, William Tudor
Hozier, Hon J. H. Cecil
Jackson, Rt. Hon. Wm. Lawies
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Jones, David Brynmor (Sw'ns'a
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Langley, Batty
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks.)
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Leighton, Stanley
Llewelyn, Sir Dillwyn- (Sw'ns'a
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lopes, Henry Yarde Buller
Lowe, Francis William
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macartney, W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Iver, Sir L. (Edinburgh, W.
Manners, Lord Edward Wm. J.
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn W. F.
Maxwell, Rt. Hon Sir Herbert E
Mellor, Colonel (Lancashire)
Mellor, Rt. Hon. J. W. (Yorks.)
Mendl, Sigismund Ferdinand
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore, J. Throgmorton
Milward, Colonel Victor
Monk, Charles James
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morgan, Hn Fred. (Monm'thsh)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. A (Deptford)
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath.
Nicol, Donald Ninian
O'Neill, Hon. Robt. Torrens
Palmer, Sir Charles M (Durham
Parkes, Ebenezer
Paulton, James Mellor
Penn, John
Percy, Earl
Phillpotts, Captain Arthur
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plunkett, Rt Hn Horace Curzon
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Remnant, James Farquharson
Richardson, Sir Thos. (Hartlep'i
Ridley, Rt. Hon Sir Matthew W.
Ritchie, Rt. Hon Chas Thomson
Robson, William Snowdon
Russell, T. W. (Tyrone)
Saunderson, Rt. Hon. Col. E. J.
Savory, Sir Joseph
Scoble, Sir Andrew Richard
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spencer, Ernest
Stanley, Sir Henry M. (Lambeth
Stephens, Henry Charles
Stewart, Sir M. J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J G (Oxf'd Univ.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C E (Taunt'n
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-under-L.
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hon. E. R (Bath
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyvill, Marmaduke D'Arcy

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Sir William Walrond and
Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allison, Robert Andrew
Austin, M. (Limerick, W.)
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Channing, Francis Allston
Clark, Dr. G. B.
Crilly, Daniel
Curran, Thomas B. (Donegal)
Doogan, P. C.
Fox, Dr. Joseph Francis
Hayden, John Patrick
Healy, Maurice (Cork)
Healy, Timothy M. (N. Louth)
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Labouchere, Henry
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macaleese, Daniel
MacDonnell, Dr. M. A. (Qu'nsC)
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
M'Hugh, Patrick A. (Leitrim)
M'Leod, John
Maddison, Fred.
Molloy, Bernard Charles
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Dowd, John
O'Malley, William
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Power, Patrick Joseph
Samuel, J. (Stockton-on-Tees)
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Steadman, William Charles
Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)
Tanner, Charles Kearns
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Captain Donelan and Mr.
Patrick O'Brien.

Resolution to be reported To-morrow; Committee to sit again To-morrow.

In pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th day of this instant July, Mr. Speaker adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at half after Seven of the clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, 26th July, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with :—

London, Walthamstow, and Epping Forest Railway (Abandonment).

The same was ordered to lie on the Table.

BRAY AND ENNISKERRY RAILWAY BILL.

Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, the opposition thereto having been withdrawn; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. The Orders made on the 13th instant and Thursday last discharged; and Bill committed forthwith.

LONDON SEA WATER SUPPLY BILL [H.L.].

Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to.

TRAMWAYS PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 5) BILL.

Reported from the Select Committee with an Amendment, and committed to a Committee of the whole House To-morrow.

DURHAM (COUNTY OF) ELECTRIC POWER SUPPLY BILL.

Reported from the Select Committee with Amendments.

TOTTENHAM URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL BILL.

Reported from the Select Committee with Amendments.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 10) BILL.

Reported from the Select Committee with an Amendment, and committed to a Committee of the whole House To-morrow.

DEVONPORT CORPORATION BILL.

Reported with Amendments.

HASTINGS CORPORATION BILL.

The Queen's consent signified; and Bill reported with Amendments.

NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE ELECTRIC SUPPLY BILL.

The Queen's consent signified; and Bill reported from the Select Committee with Amendments.

COVENTRY CORPORATION BILL.

TAUNTON CORPORATION BILL.

GAS LIGHT AND COKE, COMMERCIAL GAS AND SOUTH METROPOLITAN GAS COMPANIES BILL,

NOW

METROPOLIS GAS (PREPAYMENT METER) ACT, 1900.

SOUTHPORT CORPORATION BILL.

Reported with Amendments.

BRADFORD CORPORATION BILL.

Read 3ª, with the Amendments; a further Amendment made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.

HALIFAX CORPORATION BILL.

OLDHAM CORPORATION BILL.

Read 3ª, with the Amendments; further Amendments made; Bills passed, and returned to the Commons.

BAKER STREET AND WATERLOO RAILWAY BILL.

Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

CITY OF LONDON (VARIOUS POWERS) BILL.

Read 3ª, with the Amendments; a further Amendment made; Bill passed and returned to the Commons.

MARKET WEIGHTON DRAINAGE AND NAVIGATION BILL.

CUMBERLAND COUNTY COUNCIL (BRIDGES) BILL.

CHARING CROSS AND STRAND ELECTRICITY SUPPLY BILL.

CROYDON TRAMWAYS AND IMPROVEMENTS BILL.

Read 3ª with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

SOUTH EASTERN METROPOLITAN TRAMWAYS BILL.

PORTLAND URBAN DISTRICT GAS BILL.

Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

BURNLEY CORPORATION BILL [H.L.].

Returned from the Commons with the Amendment made by the Lords to the Amendments made by the Commons agreed to.

EDUCATION BOARD PROVISIONAL ORDER CONFIRMATION (LONDON) BILL [H.L.].

TRAMWAYS ORDERS CONFIRMATION (No. 1) BILL [H.L.].

LIVERPOOL OVERHEAD RAILWAY BILL [H L.].

Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments.

GLASGOW BUILDING REGULATIONS BILL [H.L.].

MOTHERWELL AND BELLSHILL RAILWAY BILL [H.L.].

NORTH EASTERN RAILWAY (STEAM VESSELS) BILL [H.L.].

ROTHERHAM CORPORATION BILL [H.L.].

Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to.

DUBLIN CORPORATION BILL.

CLONTARF URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL BILL.

Brought from the Commons; read 1^a; and referred to the Examiners.

SHANNON WATER AND ELECTRIC POWER BILL.

SOUTH WALES ELECTRICAL POWER DISTRIBUTION BILL.

NORTH METROPOLITAN ELECTRIC POWER SUPPLY BILL.

Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Lord Stanmore and the Lord Glanesk be proposed to the House as members of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Lord Wolverton and the Lord Aberdare; read, and agreed to.

PAISLEY WATERWORKS PROVISIONAL ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL.

Moved, That the Order made on the 12th March last, "That no Provisional Order Confirmation Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 26th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2^a; agreed to. Bill read 2^a accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the whole House To-morrow.

EDINBURGH (HOUSING OF WORKING CLASS) IMPROVEMENT SCHEME PROVISIONAL ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL.

Moved, That the Order made on the 12th March last, "That no Provisional Order Confirmation Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 26th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2^a; agreed to. Bill read 2^a accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the whole House To-morrow.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 4) BILL.

Amendments reported (according to Order), and Bill to be read 3^a to-morrow.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 9) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 14) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 12) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 6) BILL.

PERTH AND PAISLEY GAS PROVISIONAL ORDERS BILL.

House in Committee (according to Order). Bills reported without amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bills to be read 3^a to-morrow.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

AFRICA, No. 6 (1900).

Preliminary Report by Her Majesty's Special Commissioner on the Protectorate of Uganda.

COMMERCIAL, No. 3 (1900).

Reports from Her Majesty's Representatives in Europe on the metric system. Part I.

TRADE REPORTS—ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 2485. France (French Indo-China);
No. 2486. Roumania;
No. 2487. China (Tientsin).

NATIONAL GALLERY (IRELAND).

Report of the Director of the National Gallery of Ireland to the Board of Governors and Guardians, for the year 1899.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION.

Statistics of proceedings under the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1897, and the Employers' Liability Act, 1880, during the year 1899.

HISTORICAL MANUSCRIPTS (ROYAL COMMISSION).

Reports on the manuscripts of—

1. Mrs. Frankland-Russell-Astley, of Chequers Court, Bucks.
2. Lord Montagu, of Beaulieu, Hants.
3. Beverley Corporation.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

RESERVE FORCES BILL [H.L.].

Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments.

MERCHANT SHIPPING (LIABILITY OF SHIPOWNERS AND OTHERS) BILL.

[THIRD READING.]

Order of the Day for the Third Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read the third time."—(*Lord Heneage.*)

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (The Earl of HALSBURY) said he felt it his duty to give their Lordships an opportunity of protesting against this Bill. He had endeavoured to frame Amendments which would render this a more reasonable Bill, but had come to the conclusion that there were great objections to any form of amendment. The whole purpose and object of the Bill was vicious. It had been recommended to their Lordships' consideration on the ground that what were called the parties were agreed. That seemed to him a very serious thing, because "the parties" were the shipowners on the one side and the dock and harbour owners on the other. This was a circumstance which ought to put them on their guard against the Bill rather than tell in its favour, because they had these two very powerful bodies combining against the public who owned goods and had their lives and limbs to care for. Moreover, the Bill had not been brought before a single one of those bodies who were supposed to look after the commercial interests of the country. If the Bill were passed and Parliament were thus to affirm the principle of limitation of liability, it would form an irresistible argument in favour of similar legislation for every railway company in the United Kingdom, who at present were liable to the very last farthing they possessed. Clause 3 of the Bill provided that—

"The limitation of liability under this Act shall relate to the whole of any losses and damages which may arise upon any one distinct occasion, although such losses and damages may be sustained by more than one person, and shall apply whether the liability arises at common law or under any general or private Act of Parliament, and notwithstanding anything contained in such Act."

The measure of liability proposed in the Bill was absurd and grotesque. He really did not know what relation the size of the largest ship which had used the dock or harbour within five years previous to the accident had to the liability of the dock or canal owners. He objected to the mode by which the Bill came to be in its present form. The shipowners wanted additional limits, whereupon the dock-owners said, "We shall oppose you unless we get something too." The Bill was supposed to have received the patronage of the Government in the other House. As a matter of fact, the Attorney General had voted against it, and the President of the Board of Trade, with whom he (the Lord Chancellor) had thought it right to communicate, had informed him that he repudiated any responsibility for the measure, but that as he understood both parties were agreed he would not interfere. That was the extent to which his right hon. friend's support went. He begged to move that the Bill be read this day three months.

Amendment moved—

"To leave out 'now' and insert at the end of the motion, 'this day three months.'"—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

EARL EGERTON pointed out that the two great commercial cities of Liverpool and Manchester agreed in supporting the Bill. Under the Bill as it stood, the liability of Liverpool would be £136,000, whereas by the first suggested Amendment of the Lord Chancellor it would be only £50,000, and by the second Amendment it would be £530,000.

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: I have not moved those Amendments.

EARL EGERTON: No; but I am showing how difficult it is to frame any

standard other than that in the Bill. In the case of Manchester the limit of the Bill was £104,000, which was reduced to £23,000 by the Lord Chancellor's first Amendment, an utterly inadequate amount; whilst by the second Amendment it would be £230,000, which was far too much. The Bill had been very fully considered by all the parties interested, and it was agreed that no difficulty whatever would be experienced in ascertaining the tonnage of the largest vessel using the port. He trusted that the Bill, which had received the unanimous support of the commercial community, would not be rejected in consequence of any precedent which the measure might form. The shipping interest was entirely different from the railway interest, and he hoped that their Lordships would agree to pass the Bill, which was the outcome of long negotiations between the parties interested.

LORD HENEAGE said he thought their Lordships would admit that the course taken by the noble and learned Lord was extremely inconvenient. The noble and learned Lord first put down an Amendment to Clause 2 proposing as the limit of the liability of the dock or canal or harbour authority 10 per centum of the value of the dock or canal or harbour. He had endeavoured to find out what would be the effect of that Amendment, and, having gone through an immense amount of figures, he had come to the conclusion that it was utterly absurd, ridiculous, and impracticable. The noble and learned Lord changed his mind and put down another Amendment proposing that the liability was not to exceed the value of the dock or canal or harbour. That, if not more absurd than the first, was more complicated and more impracticable. But instead of moving that Amendment, for which the House had come prepared, the noble and learned Lord moved the rejection of the Bill. However, that did not matter, for if the noble and learned Lord had moved his Amendment and had carried it the Bill could not have been accepted by its promoters. The noble and learned Lord dealt with life and property at sea; this Bill had nothing to do with that subject. It was with difficulty that he was able to hear the observations of the noble and learned Lord, but he understood him to say that he (Lord Heneage) had acknowledged that the bodies representing the commercial interests of the country had not been consulted in regard to this Bill. He acknowledged nothing of the kind. In reply to Lord Avebury, who asked, at a previous stage of the Bill, if those interested in cargoes had been consulted, he (Lord Heneage) stated that he could not recollect from memory whether chambers of commerce had been consulted, but that he was perfectly certain that underwriters had been, and that they approved of the Bill. Lord Avebury himself consulted the underwriters, and said he had no Amendment to move. The second clause was not so illogical as it looked, and there would not be the slightest difficulty in obtaining information with respect to the tonnage of the largest ship that had entered the dock, canal, or harbour. He would not ask their Lordships to take his word only for this, but would quote the opinion of one of the leading lawyers in the Admiralty Court. Mr. Butler Aspinall had expressed the following opinion—

"I am of opinion that the proposed basis of dock-owners' liability, namely, £8 per ton on the largest registered ship, is practicable and can be given effect to by the Admiralty Court without difficulty or undue expense. Dock-owners who propose limiting their liability will institute an action in the Admiralty Division for that purpose. Upon the action coming on for trial, the plaintiff will have to satisfy the judge by evidence that his alleged limit is based upon the tonnage of the largest ship. This can be done in accordance with the practice of the court by affidavit and the production of the ship's register. If the defendants deny that the ship in question is the largest ship, this issue of fact can be shortly and cheaply determined. In the large majority of cases there would be no dispute as to which was the largest ship. The basis of the largest ship seems fanciful, but in truth there is no principle in determining the quantum of a wrongdoer's liability, once it is granted that he is to be allowed to limit his liability. The proposed basis is capable of being easily worked, and this to my mind is its great merit.

"I think that the Lord Chancellor's proposal would lead in many cases to great delay and heavy expenditure. In many cases there would necessarily be an expensive inquiry into what the rateable value was. The Admiralty Court has no machinery for this purpose and no officials with the necessary special knowledge to enable them to hold such inquiries. It would mean that both parties would be entitled to be heard before the tribunal holding the inquiry, presumably with a right of appeal, which most conceivably might result in the matter not being disposed of till it had reached the House of Lords for adjudication."

The Lord Chancellor said something with reference to the patronage of the Board of Trade. He (Lord Heneage) had spent the greater part of his life in the House of Commons, and had always understood, when a Bill went through that House unanimously supported by every Cabinet Minister and by the Law Officers of the Crown, that the Department had made itself responsible for the Bill, because, if it was a bad Bill, they ought to have opposed it. Even in the House of Lords Lord Balfour of Burleigh stated distinctly that the Board of Trade was in favour of the Bill, and voted against the Amendment of Lord Alverstone which was moved in Committee. The Board of Trade had loyally stood by the Bill, and was at this moment of opinion that the solution in the Bill was the only possible solution of the difficulty. He trusted their Lordships would not reject the Bill.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY said it was a scandalous thing that the spokesmen of the Government on this question should take up such varying attitudes. Notwithstanding this division of opinion, the Department really responsible had given its opinion in favour of the Bill. It seemed to him that when it was a matter of choosing between the opinion of the Board of Trade—the responsible Department—and that of any member of the Government, the best course to take was to follow the advice of the responsible Minister. The noble and learned Lord said they must be very careful in passing the Bill, because the two interests most concerned had come to an agreement. Surely one of the first considerations in matters of this kind was whether those in the country who were specially affected by the proposed law were in favour of it.

LORD ALVERSTONE asked their Lordships to consider whether the Bill was one which ought to pass, and not to put the responsibility upon any supposed agreement between shipowners and dock-owners, who were really making a bargain in their own interests without considering the interests of the persons who were really concerned. Not a single argument had been brought forward in their Lordships' House to justify the extended limitation of the liability of dock companies, except a bargain which they had concluded with the shipowners. If this absolutely new departure in the law of England were to be made, he hoped the Government would be held responsible for the alteration. He did not hesitate to say that, if it were argued on its merits, their Lordships' impartial judgment would lead them to reject this Bill.

On Question whether "now" shall stand part of the motion, their Lordships divided:—Contents, 51; Not-Contents, 22.

CONTENTS.

Argyll, D.
Northumberland, D.

Camperdown, E.
Carrington, E.
Chesterfield, E.
Dartrey, E.
Egerton, E.
Grey, E.
Kimberley, E.
Lucan, E.
Mayo, E.
Northbrook, E.
Spencer, E.
Vane, E. (*M. Londonderry*).
Yarborough, E.

Falkland, V.
Powerscourt, V.

Manchester, L. Bp.

Boyle, L. (*E. Cork and Orrery.*)
Brougham and Vaux, L.
Calthorpe, L.
Clanwilliam, L. (*E. Clanwilliam.*)
Clonbrock, L.
Cloncurry, L.
Colchester, L.
Colville of Culross, L.
Cottesloe, L.
Cranworth, L.
De Mauley, L.
De Ramsey, L.
Dormer, L.
Fermanagh, L. (*E. Erne.*)
Glenesk, L.
Greville, L.

Hare, L. (*E. Listowel.*)
Harlech, L.
Heneage, L. [*Teller.*]
Kelvin, L.
Kintore, L. (*E. Kintore.*)
Lindley, L.
Macnaughten, L. [*Teller.*]
Massy, L.
O'Brien, L.
Rathmore, L.
Ribblesdale, L.
Robertson, L.
Sherborne, L.
Sudley, L. (*E. Arran.*)
Templemore, L.
Ventry, L.
Windsor, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Halsbury, E. (*L. Chancellor.*)
Devonshire, D. (*L. President.*)
Cross, V. (*L. Privy Seal.*)

Bath, M.

Carnwath, E.
Cowper, E.
Denbigh, E.

Hardwicke, E.
Morley, E.
Waldegrave, E.

Falmouth, V.
Portman, V.
Templetown, V.

Alverstone, L. [*Teller.*]

Brampton, L.
Braye, L.
Davey, L.
Harris, L.
James, L. [*Teller.*]
Norton, L.
Sinclair, L.
Stewart of Garlies, L. (*E. Galloway.*)

Bill read 3ª, with the Amendment, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

COUNTY AND BOROUGH FRANCHISE ASSIMILATION (LONDON) BILL.

Read 3ª (according to Order), and passed.

TOWN COUNCILS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Amendments reported (according to Order), and Bill to be read 3ª on Tuesday next.

TITHE RENT-CHARGE (IRELAND) BILL.

Amendments reported (according to Order).

LORD CLONCURRY said the Amendment standing in his name did not touch any question of ecclesiastical tithes or commuted tithes; it dealt only with a limited number of lay tithes. He had no personal interest in the matter, but was confident that there would be cases of gross injustice under the Bill if the Amendment standing in his name were not inserted.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 3, page 3, line 5, after Sub-section (3) to insert Sub-section (4):—'(4) Where a tithe rent-charge has been varied by any order of a court of quarter sessions made after the passing of the Irish Church Act, 1869, the amount at which it stood before the making of the order shall, for the purposes of this clause, be taken and deemed to be the amount at which it stood on the twenty-second day of August, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-four.'"—(*Lord Cloncurry.*)

THE LORD CHANCELLOR OF IRELAND (Lord ASHBOURNE): As I understand, the Amendment has nothing whatever to say to the great numbers that are represented by ecclesiastical tithe-payers, but is confined to a very small number of lay tithe-payers. My noble friend takes exception to the principle of the Bill, which is that there shall be a revision, not, as in the old times, once possibly every seven years, but once every fifteen years. My noble friend seems to think that because there may have been some lay tithe-payers who got a revision in 1872, therefore it would be unfair to subject the owners to another revision even after a lapse of sixteen years. But where is this picking and choosing of dates to stop? I do not think my noble friend has made out his case.

Amendment, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

*THE EARL OF ARRAN moved the omission of Clause 8, which ran as follows:—

"(1) Section 1 of this Act shall not apply to any annual sum charged upon land where the estate or interest therein of the person liable to pay such annual sum has, after the creation of such charge and before the thirteenth day of April one thousand eight hundred and ninety-six, been conveyed to a purchaser on a sale.

"(2) Sections 3 and 4 of this Act shall not apply to any tithe rent-charge payable to the Land Commission out of hereditaments where the estate or interest therein of the person liable to pay such tithe rent-charge has, after the tenth day of August one thousand eight hundred and seventy-two and before the twelfth day of May one thousand eight hundred and ninety-nine, been conveyed to a purchaser on a sale.

"(3) Where the estate or interest conveyed was less than the first estate of inheritance this section shall not apply after the determination of such less estate or interest.

"(4) For the purpose of showing that this section does not apply a statutory declaration or such other evidence as the Land Commission may require shall be *prima facie* evidence.

"(5) The expression 'sale' in this section does not include a mortgage or a marriage or other family settlement or arrangement."

The noble Lord argued that this exclusion spoiled a tardy act of justice, and that the Government could not be enthusiastic in its favour as it did not form part of their original proposal. The clause was designed to exclude from the benefits of the Bill, so far as ecclesiastical tithe rent-charge, both commuted and non-commuted, was concerned, certain persons who purchased estates charged therewith subsequent to 1869 and 1872, on the ground that these purchasers had notice when they purchased that commuted tithe rent-charge had been made payable by statute for fifty-two years, or that the non-commuted rent-charge had been deprived of its variable character by the Act of 1872. Admitting that much, it must also be admitted on the other side that most of these purchasers bought at the highest prices of the century; that they purchased titles which Parliament had guaranteed to be indefeasible with the object of tempting purchasers to come forward; that they purchased *inter alia* the right to fix the rents to be paid from time to time by their tenants, and that they not only had no notice that Parliament might some day pass the land legislation of 1881, but that so recently as in the debates on the Land Bill of 1870 and on Mr. Butt's Land Bill of 1876, Mr. Gladstone and all

parties in the House of Commons except the Irish Home Rulers declared that such doctrines as fair rents, free sale, and fixity of tenure could not be listened to, and would amount to confiscation which would have to be paid for. Moreover, many tenant purchasers under the Purchase Acts bought subject to the payment of the ecclesiastical tithe rent-charge, and in such cases it would be unpopular as well as unjust to exclude them from the benefits of the Bill. Under these circumstances he hoped the Government would see the justice of withdrawing the clause and restoring the Bill to its original form.

Amendment moved—

"To leave out Clause 8."—(*The Earl of Arran.*)

THE EARL OF MAYO supported the proposal to omit Clause 8, failing to see the object of it. The second sub-section contained the sting. It simply meant that people who purchased an estate between 1872 and 1899 were to be excluded from the benefits of the Bill. They all knew that that was introduced at the instigation of a Nationalist Member, but he thought Nationalist Members in the House of Commons quite forgot that a very great number of tenants who had purchased would be hit by it. It seemed hard that landlords, and tenants who purchased between those dates, should not benefit in any way from this Bill. The clause was a niggardly clause, intended, it had been said, to strike at a certain gentleman who has purchased a large plot in Ireland, and the Bill would not be affected in any way if it were cut out.

LORD ASHBOURNE: The position in reference to this clause is one which I think I can state in a very few sentences to your Lordships. My noble friend who introduced the Amendment asked your Lordships not to spoil a tardy act of justice, and the noble Earl who has just sat down improved upon that by describing it as a niggardly little clause that might easily be left out. The Earl of Arran said this was a clause with regard to which the Government were not called upon to be specially enthusiastic. The Government are never enthusiastic. Their mission is to be just and fair, and to endeavour to present their views in clear and intelligible language. Two particular grievances are sought to be remedied, and are referred to in the section. The first is to reduce the period of payment from fifty-two to forty-five years, and the second is the question of a remedy for the hardships and inconveniences resulting from the abolition of the principle of revision in respect of ecclesiastical tithe. The clause is the outcome of discussion in the House of Commons, where it was urged that the two classes of tithe-payers referred to in the clause did not suffer under the grievance the Bill was intended to redress, inasmuch as the circumstances were fully known and taken into account when the purchases were made. It was pointed out that people who had bought with their eyes open to the fact that there could be no variation of the tithe could not be in the same position as the old owners of property. The Government admitted the force of the argument that these payers had not the same claim for variation and revision, and I hope the House will not yield to the appeal of the noble Earl, but will accept the clause.

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: Does the noble Lord press his Amendment?

THE EARL OF ARRAN: Yes.

On Question whether the clause shall stand part of the Bill, their Lordships divided:—Contents, 45; Not-Contents, 28.

CONTENTS.

Halsbury, E. (*L. Chancellor.*)	Denbigh, E.	Falkland, V.
Devonshire, D. (*L. President.*)	Feversham, E.	Portman, V.
Cross, V. (*L. Privy Seal.*)	Hardwicke, E.	
	Kimberley, E.	Manchester, L. Bp.
Bath, M.	Mayo, E. [*Teller.*]	
Lansdowne, M.	Northbrook, E.	Addington, L.
	Powis, E.	Alverstone, L.
Carnwath, E.	Selborne, E.	Ashbourne, L.
Chesterfield, E.	Spencer, E.	Balfour, L.
Clarendon, E.	Yarborough, E.	Brampton, L.
Cowper, E.		Brougham and Vaux, L.

Calthorpe, L.
Colchester, L.
Cranworth, L.
De Ramsey, L.
Glenesk, L.
Harris, L.
James, L.
Kintore, L. (*E. Kintore.*)
Lawrence, L.
Lindley, E.
Norton, L.
Robertson, L.
Rowton, L.
Sinclair, L.
Sudley, L. (*E. Arran.*) [*Teller.*]
Windsor, L.
Wolverton, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Argyll, D.
Northumberland, D.
Dartrey, E.
Egerton, E.
Lucan, E.
Waldegrave, E. [*Teller.*]
Frankfort de Montmorency, V.
Templetown, V.
Boyle, L. (*E. Cork & Orrery.*)
Churchill, L. [*Teller.*]
Clanwilliam, L. (*E. Clanwilliam.*)
Clonbrock, L.
Cloncurry, L.
Dormer, L.
Fermanagh, L. (*E. Erne.*)
Greville, L.
Hare, L. (*E. Listowel.*)
Harlech, L.
Heneage, L.
Macnaghten, L.
Massy, L.
O'Brien, L.
O'Neill, L.
Rathmore, L.
Sherborne, L.
Stewart of Garlies, L. (*E. Galloway.*)
Templemore, L.
Ventry, L.

*Lord CLONBROCK moved the omission of Clause 9, which was as follows:—

"Sub-section 1 of Section 37 of the Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1896 (which dispenses with the consent of the Treasury to the redemption of tithe rent-charge as therein mentioned), shall not have effect in the case of any tithe rent-charge to which Section 3 of this Act applies."

He had stated on the second reading that he did not propose to move any Amendment, but that referred to the Bill as it then was. He did not know that his noble and learned friend would move the introduction of this new clause. The effect of his Amendment would, he said, be to restore the Bill as it left the House of Commons, and to fix once more the former price at which tithe rent-charge could be redeemed. By the Act of 1869 the price was fixed at 22½ years purchase. This was decidedly exorbitant, for it was well known that before the Church Act the value of tithe rent-charge was only about seventeen years purchase at the outside. The Church Fund benefited by this increase to the extent of something like half-a-million sterling, and the tithe rent-charge payers who redeemed had to do so at this high rate. In 1896 it seemed to have dawned on the Government that the amount fixed was excessive, and a change was made to twenty years, not out of tenderness to the landlords, but simply because they found that the high price at which a landlord had to redeem his tithe rent-charge disinclined him to sell to the tenant, and that the system of purchase in which the Government were so much interested was thereby impeded. This was clearly stated on the introduction of the Land Bill of 1896 by the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant. In introducing the Land Bill of 1896 Mr. Gerald Balfour said*—

"How are you to quicken the pace [of the Land Purchase Acts]? First of all we must try in every way we can to oil the machinery. We must study the various impediments in the existing system which make tenants slow to buy and the landlords slow to sell. We must, if possible, remove those impediments, and try to make purchase more attractive to the tenants, and sale more attractive to the landlords. We have in this Bill made various proposals with a view to effecting this object."

Mr. Gerald Balfour then proceeded to describe these proposals, and, on coming to the subject of tithe rent-charge, said—

"Another concession which we propose to make to landlords selling to their tenants has reference to the redemption of tithe rent-charge in case of sale. Under the Act of 1887 the Land Commission were empowered to allow the landlords to redeem the tithe rent-charge in case of sale at less than the statutory period of 22½ years provided the Treasury gave their consent. The Land Commission have, as a matter of fact, repeatedly applied to the Treasury to give their consent, and the Treasury have always refused it. Under this Bill the Land Commission are to be empowered to allow the landlords to redeem the tithe rent-charge at anything over twenty years purchase without asking the consent of the Treasury."

It was this provision in the Land Act of 1896 which would be repealed by this clause. He commended these arguments to the consideration of Her Majesty's Government. A landlord could only sell to his tenants at a considerable loss of income; in fact, he usually only did so from a feeling of despair at the unjust manner in which he had been treated, and in the hope that he thus might save some-

* See *The Parliamentary Debates* [Fourth Series], Vol. xxxix., page 809.

thing out of the fire. The change would therefore add to his previous disinclination to sell. Instead of trying in every way to "oil the machinery," the Government were, by restoring the twenty-two and a half years, doing the very thing which would impede the better and freer operation of the purchase system. They were taking away with one hand part of what was given with the other. The fund had gained half a million of money by this extravagant charge for a great number of years, and any loss which would be sustained must be by driblets. Moreover, it could not be absolutely certain that there would be a loss, for in the Treasury Minute of 14th July of last year it was stated that—

"Neither the future annual extent of the operations under those Acts (the Purchase Acts) nor the proportion in which such operations will apply to lands subject to tithe can be predicted with any confidence."

It further stated that the Treasury contemplated that there might be a loss, only at some future period. If this fund had been charged by successive Governments with more than it could bear, it was hard that the tithe-payer should in consequence suffer by having a larger sum extracted from him. If the Treasury thought this clause so important, why was it not introduced before instead of being slipped in at the last moment? He hoped the Government would consent to his Amendment and restore the Bill to what it was when it left the House of Commons.

Amendment moved—

"To leave out Clause 9."—(*Lord Clonbrock.*)

*THE EARL OF ERNE thought they had some reason to complain of the course which had been taken in regard to this clause. The clause was forced upon the Irish Government by the Treasury and would not have been introduced otherwise. There were plenty of opportunities in the House of Commons for the clause to have been inserted, but this was not done. Many noble Lords had left London on the understanding that no alteration would be made in the structure of the Bill and that only drafting Amendments would be agreed to. As his noble friend had told the House, this clause practically confiscated two and a half years purchase of tithe rent-charge when they came to sell, and in that way took away one of the important concessions which were made to Irish landlords in 1896. Noble Lords from Ireland were placed in rather a difficult position in regard to this matter. He fully conceded that the Government had met them fairly, having pressed this Bill, which would give some relief, through the House of Commons at the expense of other Bills on the whole. He would suggest that his noble friend should be content with his protest and not press the Amendment.

THE EARL OF MAYO said this was an instance of rather sharp practice on the part of the Treasury. Why, he asked, should the Treasury suddenly slip in, in the passage of the Bill from one House to the other, a little piece of legislation which really cut off some of the benefits of the Bill? The tithe rent-charge was expected to be reduced 20 per cent. under the Bill, and £100 paid now would therefore become £80. Twenty years purchase of £80 would be £1,600, but twenty-two and a half years purchase would be £1,800; therefore the purchase money was increased by £200. It had not been possible to debate the matter in Committee because the Lord Chancellor of Ireland suggested that owing to the lateness of the hour the Amendments should be postponed till the present stage. This increase of two and a half years would not affect the Church Fund for a great number of years, and Mr. Balfour said in the House of Commons that it would not be in the least necessary to go into the question of the solvency of the Church Fund thirty years hence. What could be the object, therefore, of the Treasury adding on this two and a half years? What he objected to was that the clause had been put in after the Bill left the House of Commons. The Government had, so to speak, through the Treasury, gone back upon the arrangement that there should be no Amendments in the House of Lords. What an outcry there would have been if anything of the same kind had been done in a matter affecting the tenants.

LORD ASHBOURNE: I am very sorry that any noble Lord in this House should for a moment think that there has been anything in the slightest degree unfair or savouring of sharpness or unworthy practice in connection with this Bill. There has really been no change of view on this matter. The Chief Secretary

expressed his views clearly in the other House in reply to an Amendment proposed by Mr. Dillon suggesting that there should be no redemption of ecclesiastical tithe save at twenty-five years purchase. The right hon. Gentleman then said he thought it would be reasonable that the price should not be less than twenty-two and a half years purchase. When I was moving the Second Reading of the Bill I referred to the way in which that matter would be dealt with. What is the history of this question? In the Church Act of 1869, Mr. Gladstone's measure as to the price of redemption was twenty-two and a half years purchase, and that has been the governing figure. When in 1887 a modification was suggested, it was subject to the assent of the Treasury, which was the arbiter. At that period the position of tithe rent-charge payers appealed to the sympathy of the Government. It was felt that the abolition of the power of revision by the Act of 1872 worked harshly. Prices had fallen, the English tithe rent-payer had been relieved to some extent, and therefore in 1896 it was deemed that the position of the Irish tithe rent-payer needed some further measure of consideration, and for the first time the Land Commission was given power at its discretion to say that redemption might take place at twenty years purchase. Under this Bill the power of revision is restored in a large and substantial way. The Treasury considered that the large reduction of the tithe-payers' payments under this Bill was a great and substantial benefit, and under those circumstances it was right to restore to the Treasury the power of saying whether twenty-two and a half years purchase was not the right figure. Whether you concur or not with the views of the Government or the Treasury, you will see that their action has been uniform and consistent all through, and that ample notice was given in the House of Commons.

On Question, That Clause 9 stand part of the Bill, agreed to.

Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow.

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES ACT (1890) AMENDMENT BILL.

Amendments reported (according to Order), and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow.

Lord Ashbourne.

CRUELTY TO WILD ANIMALS IN CAPTIVITY BILL.

Bill read 3ª (according to Order).

Amendments agreed to.

LORD JAMES OF HEREFORD: The promoters of this Bill gave a pledge in the memorandum to the Bill that it should not affect any legitimate sport, such as hunting or coursing, and I was under the impression when I read the Bill that it carried out their intention. I consulted two of my learned colleagues in this House and they agreed with me: but the question was raised in the Standing Committee, and my attention was called to the fact that the Law Officers of the Crown were of opinion that it might be contended that stag hunting or rabbit coursing was included. The object of my Amendment is to remove any doubt on the subject.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 4, line 26, after '1876' to insert 'nor to the hunting or coursing of any animal which has not been liberated in a mutilated or injured state in order to facilitate its capture or destruction.'"—(*Lord James of Hereford.*)

THE EARL OF CORK: I am glad that my noble and learned friend has moved to insert these words, because there are very grave doubts whether the Bill in its present form would not put an end to rabbit coursing, a sport of which I am not enamoured, but one which affords much pleasure to many individuals. I am certain those who pursue this sport will thank the noble and learned Lord for his Amendment, and will do everything they possibly can to prevent in future any cruelty being done to these animals.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"To insert as a new clause, 'This Act shall not extend to Scotland.'"—(*Lord James of Hereford.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.

LUNACY BOARD (SCOTLAND) (SALARIES, ETC.) BILL.

House in Committee (according to Order). Bill reported without amendment; and re-committed to the Standing Committee.

PROHIBITION OF EXPORTATION OF ARMS BILL [H.L.].

Amendment made; Bill read 3ª (according to Order), and passed, and sent to the Commons.

OIL IN TOBACCO BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE LORD PRIVY SEAL (Viscount CROSS): My Lords, I have to ask your Lordships to give a Second Reading to this Bill, which, though a small one, is one of considerable importance. Your Lordships will remember that under the Finance Acts manufacturers of tobacco are not allowed to use more than a certain amount of water. If the law is not complied with in this respect heavy penalties are imposed, but manufacturers of tobacco have evaded the law by using oil in addition to water. This is now done to an extent which makes it injurious to the consumer. It also seriously affects the revenue, and works hardly on the honest trader. The Chancellor of the Exchequer has introduced this Bill to stop this practice, which works mischief all the way round. The object of the Bill is to limit the amount of oil used in tobacco, the quantity of oil permitted by the measure as it stands being 3 per cent., but the Government are willing to extend it to 4 per cent. when the Bill gets into Committee.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Viscount Cross.*)

On Question agreed to; Bill read 2ª accordingly and committed to a Committee of the whole House To-morrow.

MILITIA REORGANISATION.

LORD BRAYE: My Lords, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in the general scheme for the reorganisation of the Army which, it is understood, is under consideration, the Government are prepared to pay special attention to the question of the Militia in general, and to the position of the Militia in time of war; whether the matter of Militia battalions volunteering for foreign and for active service will engage their attention, with a view to place the present uncertain, undefined, and unsatisfactory system on a proper basis; whether, in cases where a large portion of the battalion do volunteer and the minority do not, distinct regulations will be enacted to govern the acceptance or the rejection by the authorities of the offer; whether the present irregular system will be abolished—that is to say, the system (if it can be so called) whereby the volunteering is made to depend on the success of the persuasive powers of commanding officers, company officers, and non-commissioned officers, and whereby those (many or few) of the men who adhere to their engagement to serve only in the United Kingdom, except their consent is obtained to serve abroad, are placed at a disadvantage in the eyes of their fellow-soldiers; whether clear rules can be officially laid down as to the liability, in future, of the whole Militia to serve without volunteering; or whether, if that is not practicable, certain battalions can be raised and privileged to so serve; or, again, if that is impracticable, whether individual volunteers from Militia battalions will be accepted and transferred to the Regular Army, and incorporated therein; or, if that cannot be, whether any regulation will be framed which, in the opinion of the Government, can meet the desired end. I also wish to ask how many battalions of Militia have volunteered during the present war; how many of these have had their offers accepted, and how many rejected; whether any rule governs such acceptance and rejection; whether any battalions are ever asked by the authorities if they will serve or not, or whether the initiative has come, and is expected to come, from the battalions themselves; how many of the battalions who may have volunteered have done so unanimously; how many (if any) partially and conditionally; and how many (if any) have refused to volunteer; whether it is in contemplation to raise the Militia to a position approximating to the Regular Army, with adequate years of training, and with adequate pensions and foreign service, or to limit its service wholly to the United Kingdom, or to make any fundamental change in the organisation of the Militia.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (The Marquess of LANSDOWNE): The noble and gallant Lord has adopted

a procedure which is not without its advantage with the temperature at the present point. He has asked his questions in the briefest possible terms, and placed his arguments at some length on the Notice Paper. His questions relate to two matters. He desires, in the first place, to be made aware of our intentions with regard to various questions of importance affecting the Militia force, and he also asks for information as to certain matters of fact connected with the circumstances under which certain Militia battalions have lately been allowed to volunteer for service abroad. It may, perhaps, have escaped the attention of the noble Lord that, on the occasion of a recent debate on the subject of the Militia Ballot, I stated at length that there were certain changes which the Government intended to make at once in the Militia, but that with regard to the reorganisation of the force and the alteration of its conditions of service we proposed to take no final step until we had been able to consider other questions of Army reorganisation, which, as I tried to show your Lordships, are very intimately connected with the question of the reorganisation of the Militia. I told the House that I, for my part, was much attracted by the idea of rendering the whole of the Militia force liable in time of war for service beyond the United Kingdom. I recognised that that, of course, involved the reconsideration of the question of the Militia bounty and the general conditions under which the force was recruited, and that it would also mean the disappearance of the present system under which Militia battalions are allowed to volunteer for service abroad. If a change was made affecting the whole Militia force there would no longer be any occasion to resort to volunteering. It would disappear with all the inconveniences which are called attention to in the questions of the noble Lord. That being the case, I confess I do not think there is very much advantage in discussing hypothetically the regulations which might or might not be enacted for the purpose of governing the acceptance or the rejection by the authorities of the offer of Militia battalions to serve abroad; nor, of course, is it possible for me to give the noble Lord any information as to the rules which might hereafter be laid down as to the liability of the force to serve with or without volunteering. Still less is it possible for me to give the noble and gallant Lord any definite assurance of the kind which he seems to expect when he asks his last question as to the fundamental changes in the organisation of the Militia which we may hereafter find it desirable to introduce. I hope, therefore, that the noble Lord will not press me further on this point, but will be content with the assurance which I gave the House the other evening, and which, I think, satisfied those of your Lordships who were good enough to listen to me on that occasion. Then the noble Lord asks me some specific questions with regard to the circumstances under which certain Militia battalions lately volunteered for service outside the United Kingdom. The facts are these. Thirty battalions have gone to South Africa, four to the Mediterranean, and one to the island of St. Helena. Of these thirty-five battalions, thirteen volunteered without any intimation from the War Office that it was intended to offer them the opportunity of serving abroad. The other twenty-two battalions volunteered in response to an intimation made to them that their services would be acceptable should they be disposed to offer them. But besides the thirteen battalions which volunteered spontaneously, forty other battalions also volunteered without any invitation from the military authorities. The noble Lord asks whether there is any rule which governs the acceptance or rejection of these offers from Militia battalions. There is no fixed rule. The decision rests with the Commander-in-Chief, who is, I believe, influenced by the strength of the battalion, the age of the men of whom it is composed, and by its general reputation for efficiency. Another question the noble Lord asked me was, "How many of the battalions who have volunteered have done so unanimously?" I find that in every battalion there were a certain number of individual Militiamen who declined to serve abroad. There were five battalions which were offered the chance of so serving and which refused altogether, or, in other words, in those battalions the number of men who offered themselves was not sufficient to justify the acceptance of their services. I think those are the whole of the questions as to matters of fact which the noble Lord has asked me.

Marquess of Lansdowne.

I may, perhaps, be allowed to say that I am very far from disagreeing with the noble Lord in the view which I collect from his questions—namely, that there is a certain inconvenience in the system under which at present offers are accepted from Militia battalions. I have indicated to your Lordships that personally I should be very glad to see a change made in the constitution of the force which would enable us to get rid altogether both of the Militia Reserve, which is so unpopular with Militia officers, and also of the present system of volunteering. I do not think, so far as I am able to learn, that any undue pressure has been put upon the men, but I certainly think there is an objection to a system which lends itself to the suspicion that pressure of that kind may be applied.

LORD BRAYE: I beg to thank the noble Marquess for having put the matter so clearly before the House, and to express my pleasure that the Government have seriously in view the whole question of the Militia force.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—THE COLONIAL TROOPS AND WAR MEDALS.

EARL CARRINGTON: My Lords, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether there is any truth in a rumour which has been widely circulated that a separate war medal or war decoration will be issued to Her Majesty's Colonial troops, or whether the Colonial troops will receive the war medal issued to British troops, and a fair proportion of all honours, distinctions, and rewards which will be granted to Her Majesty's troops raised in Great Britain and Ireland.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, there is no truth in the rumour that a separate war medal or decoration is likely to be bestowed upon Her Majesty's Colonial troops. The Colonial forces will receive the South African Medal, which will be bestowed upon the whole of the troops, British and Colonial, and it will be a medal of the shape and form usual in such cases. With regard to the other part of the question, I think the noble Lord may rest assured that a fair proportion of all honours, distinctions, and awards which may be granted to Her Majesty's forces will fall to the share of the Colonial troops, who have behaved with so much credit to themselves during the present campaign. I cannot undertake to discuss what the proportion will be, but my noble friend need have no uneasiness on that subject.

LORD STRATHCONA AND MOUNT ROYAL: I am sure the answer of the noble Marquess will give great satisfaction not only in the Colonies but throughout the mother country. I would suggest that the more promptly the medals can be given after the conclusion of the war the better they will be appreciated. Medals have been given within the last three or four months for services rendered thirty and thirty-four years ago. It would naturally have been more satisfactory to all those who were entitled to receive these medals, many of whom have died in the meantime, if they had been given within a reasonable time. I have no doubt that it will be otherwise in the present case.

House adjourned at twenty minutes before Seven of the clock, till To-morrow, a quarter past Four of the clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 26th July, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

DUBLIN CORPORATION BILL.

Order for consideration, as amended read.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.) said of course he offered no opposition whatever to the Bill, but he wanted to know what was the position taken by the Government in regard to the recommendations made by the Joint Committee. The Amendments on the Paper in his name were all agreed Amendments. They were very numerous, but they were agreed to between the Dublin Corporation and the Dublin County Council and the other local authorities, and they were entirely non-contentious. One of the Amendments was not to be moved, because it was objected to by the county council. He had now to express the hope that the chairman of the Joint Committee, Sir U. Kay-Shuttleworth,

would be good enough to say a few words as to the position taken up by himself and the other members of the Joint Committee as to what should be done next session. There was a strong desire that an equalisation of rates should be made extending over the entire townships. He congratulated the chairman of the Committee on having proposed the recommendations with the unanimous assent both of the Members of the House of Commons and of the House of Lords forming the Committee. He thought he had done them very considerable service, but at the same time he did not say that Dublin did not wish for considerably more than they had got. Still they would take what they could get. He was sure that Sir U. Kay-Shuttleworth would back up his recommendations, and he trusted that the Government would be induced next session to bring in a Bill as suggested. This was not the first time that local government matters had been dealt with in public Bills.

SIR U. KAY-SHUTTLEWORTH (Lancashire, Clitheroe): Perhaps after the appeal made to me by my hon. and learned friend I shall be expected by the House to say a word or two, having had the honour to be chairman of the Joint Committee which for twenty-five days sat to consider this very contentious matter. We were practically unanimous, although we were unable to come to a unanimous view on some important points. Having failed to arrive at a unanimous view on those points, we did our best to arrange a compromise which, as we think, will carry out the main objects of the Bill, which are acceptable to us all. I am happy to say that in that we were successful. My hon. and learned friend has alluded to two points on which he is anxious to know what line the Government are likely to take. For that, of course, I cannot speak with any authority, but I should like to impress upon the Government publicly what I have done privately—namely, the justice and importance, and I might even say the necessity, of spreading the burden which now falls so heavily upon Central Dublin, upon the poorest of the poor, over the whole of Dublin, so that the richest townships, the residential parts of the town, should contribute their proportion towards the burden of taxation. I attach great importance to that. I do not think the strong sense of injustice now existing among the inhabitants of the city of Dublin can possibly be overcome unless the Government apply the same principle to Dublin as has been applied with so much success to London in the shape of the equalisation of rates. If Belgravia did not contribute as much as it does to the rates which fall so heavily upon the East End of London there would be a great scandal. Now that has been remedied in London, and I hope Her Majesty's Government may feel the absolute necessity of applying the same principle as has been applied with so much success in London to lighten the burden falling upon the poorer parts of Dublin. There is another point on which the Committee made a unanimous recommendation, which I hope the Government will consider. We were convinced that it would be absolutely absurd if the two drainage systems were to continue to exist side by side over the drainage area in Dublin, one dealing with untreated sewage falling into the bay within the city walls, while the system now being carried out by the Corporation of Dublin treats its sewage in a scientific way, which results in a comparatively pure effluent being poured out at the very point where Rathmines and Pembroke are discharging the impure effluent. There would be a great advantage in having a joint drainage board to manage the whole business of drainage, and the advantage would not be confined to having the drainage treated alike over both parts. There would be an immense advantage in having the necessary burden spread over the rich districts as well as the poor. It would be a further advantage, in the opinion of the Committee, if the three governing bodies —Pembroke, Rathmines, and Dublin— were to work on the same board, as they might learn to respect each other in managing that great business together. I have ventured to press upon the Chief Secretary and the Attorney General for Ireland the views of the Committee on this subject. I understand the position they take up is this—they assure those who are interested in the subject, as all members of the Committee necessarily are after their laborious inquiry, that they will give the most careful consideration to the Committee's suggestions, and that they will forward their answer to the corporation before the month of

November, in order that the corporation may be free to take such steps as it feels it its duty to do, supposing the Government do not deal with the question. I earnestly hope that, in view of this special inquiry by a Joint Committee of both Houses, and of the unanimous recommendations to which they have been able to agree, Her Majesty's Government will take up those points. If the Committee's recommendations are carried out, we shall consider that very good fruit has resulted from our labours.

Question proposed, "That the Bill be now considered."

Bill considered.

A Clause added.

Amendments made.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time."—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

MR. WHITMORE (Chelsea) said that as a member of the Joint Committee he would be sorry if the House passed the Third Reading without an expression of opinion from some members of the Committee who sat on the Ministerial side of the House in support of the appeal made by the right hon. Baronet. He certainly was as much in earnest as the right hon. Baronet in hoping that the Government would give effect as soon as possible to the unanimous Report of the Joint Committee. He attached very great importance to the practical suggestions it contained. He was perfectly certain that the constitution of a joint drainage board would be fruitful of good results. It was rather interesting to remember that the Central Government of London really owed its existence to the institution of a drainage board for this great metropolis. While he personally felt unable to bring Rathmines and Pembroke, against their obvious desire, into the corporation, he did earnestly hope that the Government would give effect to the recommendations of the Committee.

SIR ROBERT MOWBRAY (Lambeth, Brixton) said he should like to associate himself, also as a supporter of the Government, with the appeal made by the chairman of the Joint Committee and by his hon. friend the Member for Chelsea. He held the strongest possible opinion that this question should be settled on the lines they had recommended, and he earnestly hoped, therefore, that the Government would give serious attention to the recommendations of the Committee, and would carry them into law within a very short period of time.

MR. T. M. HEALY thought it was very greatly to be regretted that Government were, apparently, not ready to respond to the strong and unanimous appeal of the members of the Committee. It was unique, in the case of private Bills, that the members of the Conservative party as well as those belonging to the Liberal party on the Committee should join together in an appeal to the Government to make a statement as to their intentions on that particular subject. He would like to ask the Chief Secretary whether the Government would bring in a public Bill to carry out the recommendations, because, unless they did so, or announced their intention of doing so, the Dublin Corporation would be compelled in its own defence to undertake the expense of again introducing a private Bill to annex these two townships. If the Government would give the pledge asked for it would be a saving of public time and money.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. G. W. BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): I am afraid I am not in a position to go beyond what has been already said by the First Lord of the Treasury—namely, that the matter will receive the careful consideration that a recommendation from so important a body as this Committee deserves. At the same time I must say, with reference to what has fallen from the hon. and learned Gentleman, that on Friday I saw the Lord Mayor of Dublin, who made a similar request, and I informed him that, although I could not give him an answer at the present time, I would give him an answer before the end of November as to the course the Government intend to adopt—in other words, that a definite answer should be given by the Government before it becomes necessary that the corporation should go to any expense in the matter of bringing in a new Bill to deal with the question next year. I hope the answer will be satisfactory.

Mr. HARWOOD (Bolton) said that, as the only other member of the Joint Committee in that House, he would like to support the appeal. Reference had been made to one side of the House and the other side of the House, but there had been no side of the House on the Committee. They were absolutely unanimous, not by any management, but by their own impulse. They believed that the state of the housing of the poor was a social danger in Dublin, and he hoped the Chief Secretary would give the matter his most careful attention.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed.

BARNSLEY CORPORATION BILL [Lords].

DUBLIN, WICKLOW, AND WEXFORD RAILWAY BILL [Lords].

NORTH BRITISH RAILWAY BILL [Lords].

Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

RAMSGATE CORPORATION IMPROVEMENTS BILL [Lords].

Queen's consent signified; read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

NORTH EASTERN RAILWAY BILL [Lords]. (BY ORDER.)

As amended, considered; an Amendment made.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Queen's consent signified; Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

CLONTARF URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL BILL.

Ordered, That, in the case of the Clontarf Urban District Council Bill, Standing Orders 84, 214, and 239 be suspended, and that the Bill be now taken into consideration, provided amended prints shall have been previously deposited.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Bill accordingly considered, as amended.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Queen's consent signified; Bill read the third time, and passed.

GLASGOW DISTRICT TRAMWAYS BILL [Lords] (BY ORDER).

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be re-committed to the former Committee."—Debate arising,

Motion made, and Question, "That the debate be now adjourned," put, and negatived.

TRAMWAYS ORDERS CONFIRMATION (No. 3) BILL [Lords].

Ordered, That, in the case of the Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 3) Bill [Lords], Standing Orders 211 and 236 be suspended, and that the Committee on the Bill have leave to sit and proceed upon Monday next. — (*Mr. Caldwell.*)

TRAMWAYS ORDERS CONFIRMATION (No. 4) BILL [Lords].

Ordered, That, in the case of the Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 4) Bill [Lords], Standing Orders 211 and 236 be suspended, and that the Committee on the Bill have leave to sit and proceed upon Monday next.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

DUBLIN CORPORATION BILL AND CLONTARF URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL BILL.

Ordered, That the Minutes of Proceedings of the Joint Committee on the Dublin Corporation Bill and Clontarf Urban District Council Bill be printed. [No. 301.]

SHEFFIELD CORPORATION BILL [Lords].

Reported from the Select Committee on Police and Sanitary Regulations Bills (Section A), with Amendments. Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Great Indian Peninsula Railway Company Bill, without amendment.

That they have agreed to—London County Council (Money) Bill; Ilfracombe Improvement Bill, London and North Western Railway (Wales) Bill; East London Water Bill; London and North Western Railway Bill; Blackpool, St. Anne's, and Lytham Tramways Bill, with Amendments.

That they have agreed to Amendments to—Great Grimsby Street Tramways Bill [Lords], Margate Pier and Harbour Bill [Lords], Bury and District Water (Transfer) Bill [Lords], Preston Corporation Bill [Lords], without amendment.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

MARRIAGE ACT, 1898.

Return [presented 25th July] to be printed. [No. 299.]

HISTORICAL MANUSCRIPTS (ROYAL COMMISSION).

Copy presented, of Report on the Manuscripts of Mrs. Frankland-Russell-Astley, of Chequers Court, Bucks [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

Copy presented, of Report on the Manuscripts of Lord Montagu, of Beaulieu, Hants [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

Copy presented, of Report on the Manuscripts of Beverley Corporation [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION.

Copy presented, of Statistics of Proceedings under the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1897, and the Employers' Liability Act, 1880, during the year 1899 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

NATIONAL EDUCATION (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Sixty-sixth Report of the Commissioners, being for the year 1899-1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

Copy presented, of Section I. of the Appendix to the Sixty-sixth Report of the Commissioners [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

Copy presented, of Section II. of the Appendix to the Sixty-sixth Report of the Commissioners [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

Copy presented, of Section III. of the Appendix to the Sixty-sixth Report of the Commissioners [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

Copy presented, of Section IV. of the Appendix to the Sixty-sixth Report of the Commissioners [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

AFRICA (No. 6, 1900).

Copy presented, of Preliminary Report by Her Majesty's Special Commissioner on the Protectorate of Uganda [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Inquiry into Charities (Administrative County of Durham).—Further Return relative thereto [ordered 14th February; *Mr. Grant Lawson*]; to be printed. [No. 300.]

LONDON (EQUALISATION OF RATES) ACT, 1894 (ACCOUNTS UNDER SECTION 1 (7) OF THE ACT).

Return ordered, "showing, according to the Accounts for the twelve months preceding the 31st day of March, 1900, furnished to the Local Government Board under Section 1 (7) of the London (Equalisation of Rates) Act, 1894—

(1) The sanitary authorities to whom payments under the Act were made by the London County Council during the year;

(2) The amount so received by each sanitary authority during the year;

(3) The amount of the expenses incurred during the year by each such sanitary authority (*a*) under the Public Health (London) Act, 1891 (including expenses of scavenging streets); (*b*) in respect of lighting; and (*c*) in respect of streets (other than the expenses of scavenging); and

(4) The amount expended during the year by each such sanitary authority out of the sums received by them under the Act;

(in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 323, of Session 1899)."—(*Mr. T. W. Russell.*)

QUESTIONS.

CHINA—ANTI-FOREIGN OUTBREAK—RECENT NEWS—CHINA PAPERS.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if there is any news from China, and when the Papers relating to China will be laid on the Table.

*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): We

have no further news from China. There are many unconfirmed rumours from various quarters. But we have no official information. As regards China Papers, I hope they will be in the hands of Members on Monday next.

HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL ARRANGEMENTS IN CHINA.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he will state what arrangements have been made, or will be made, for the sick and wounded among the British troops in China.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord G. HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): With the troops proceeding from India, numbering about 9,600 officers and men, thirty-three sections of field hospitals are being sent (825 beds); and in reply to a query from me the Viceroy has telegraphed that "they are fully provided with medical stores, which need not be sent specially from England." In addition to these troops from India, about 1,400 British officers and men are proceeding from Hong Kong, South Africa, and England. I am asking Hong Kong what field hospitals were sent on with their contingent. Three hospital ships are being provided. One by the Government of India; one, the "Maine," by the generosity of the Atlantic Transport Company and the benevolent exertions of American ladies; and one by the munificence of his Highness the Maharaja Sindia of Gwalior. These will all be fully equipped in every respect. The "Maine" sailed from Southampton on the 11th instant. In addition to these vessels, General Gaselee has been authorised, should he deem it necessary, to convert three selected transports into hospital ships. As soon as he reaches Wei-hai-wei, General Gaselee will report fully on the suitability of that place for the location of his base hospitals.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR — HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL ARRANGEMENTS INQUIRY.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether his attention has been directed to the statement of Lord Justice Romer at the opening of the sitting of the South African Hospitals Commission, that he or his colleagues had been appointed by the warrant of the Prime Minister; and whether he can say what authority the Prime Minister has for the issue of such a warrant; and will he have any objection to lay a copy of this document upon the Table.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): The Commission to which the hon. Gentleman refers is now a Royal Commission. Any Secretary of State, as the hon. Member is aware, has power to appoint a Commission.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Was Lord Justice Romer correct or incorrect when he said that he was acting under the warrant of the Prime Minister?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: He certainly received the warrant of the Prime Minister.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: What was the authority of the Prime Minister to give that warrant?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: He is Secretary of State.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: It should have been a warrant from the Crown. I beg now to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he will state why the South African Hospitals Commission was not created by statute and invested by statute with powers of examining witnesses on oath, enforcing the attendance of witnesses, and procuring documents.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: There will be no difficulty in getting sufficient evidence. I certainly should not suggest the unusual course of making this a Statutory Commission until the necessity for it is demonstrated. Her Majesty gave her consent to this being a Royal Commission on the evening of Monday. I received it on Tuesday morning.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Was not the Pigott Commission a Statutory Commission?

MR. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the Commission to report on the arrangements for the care and treatment of the sick and wounded

in South Africa has commenced its inquiry by virtue of a warrant issued by the Prime Minister; and, if so, what is the nature of this warrant, and by what authority, statutory or otherwise, has it been issued; whether it is intended to supersede this warrant by the issue of a Royal Commission; and, if so, when will the Royal Commission be issued; and, whether, seeing that compulsory powers to compel the attendance and examination of witnesses can be given by Parliament alone, he will at once introduce a Bill to confer these powers on the Commission, in accordance with numerous precedents.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have answered this question already.

MR. PICKERSGILL: When was the Royal Warrant issued?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Her Majesty gave her assent on Monday evening, and I received it on Tuesday morning.

MARTIAL LAW IN CAPE COLONY.

MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN (Montgomeryshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether martial law was proclaimed in the several districts of Cape Colony previously enumerated by the civil or the military authorities; whether it is still in force in these districts; and whether the proclamations were made by the civil or the military authorities.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): Martial law was proclaimed by the Governor, and the proclamations were countersigned by the Prime Minister. Martial law has been withdrawn from three districts; from Cathcart and Queenstown by proclamation dated 16th July, and from Glen Grey by proclamation dated 23rd July.

ARMY MEDICAL DEPARTMENT—CIVIL SURGEONS—ALLEGED PLEDGE OF SECRECY.

DR. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, W.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether he is now in a position to give the House any further information respecting the statement that civil surgeons employed in South Africa have been required by the Army Medical Department to sign a contract in which they undertook not to divulge in any way what their impressions might be as to hospital matters.

*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): No, Sir. No reply has as yet been received from Lord Roberts.

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid): When may we expect one?

[No answer was given.]

COMFORTS FOR THE TROOPS—FAILURES IN DELIVERY.

MR. H. S. FOSTER (Suffolk, Lowestoft): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that quantities of warm clothing, tobacco, and other comforts sent from time to time to the Imperial Yeomanry in South Africa have failed to reach their destination, notwithstanding every effort by the authorities in England; and that cablegrams have been sent from the Imperial Yeomanry offices in London and from the relatives of those engaged to the officer in charge of the base depôt at Cape Town, and the reply prepaid, inquiring as to the non-delivery of parcels known to have arrived there, without receiving any reply; whether, in particular, a consignment of winter clothing and necessaries to the value of nearly £5,000, sent out to the Imperial Yeomanry at the front, was taken out to the Cape in the transport "Princess Royal," and actually brought back to London without having been landed; and, if so, will he state who is responsible, and will an inquiry be held.

*MR. WYNDHAM: An official complaint of the non-delivery of cases of stores despatched by the Imperial Yeomanry Committee has reached the War Office, and a full inquiry is being made at the various ports in South Africa. In the particular instance given the "British Princess" appears to be the transport intended; all the cases taken out in that vessel were landed.

HONNEN SPRUIT DISASTER.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if he can state whether, at Honnen Spruit, near Kroonstad, on the 25th of June last, 300 ex-prisoners of war,

sent from Pretoria to hold the spruit in anticipation of an attack by De Wet, were armed with old Westley-Richards and Mauser rifles surrendered by the Boers; that the party had no Maxims, and was without either a surgeon or hospital staff; whether, seeing that there were thousands of Mausers with a large supply of ammunition in Pretoria at the time, will he state who was responsible for the despatch of this force in such a condition; and whether he has been informed that the ignorance of the enemy as to the weapons with the force, coupled with Colonel Bullock's prompt action, alone saved the force from annihilation; and also that the safety of the wounded was entirely due to the voluntary services and marked resourcefulness of Dr. Lenthal Cheatle, one of the consulting surgeons sent to the front, who was a chance passenger by the train that was attacked.

*MR. WYNDHAM: There is no information at the War Office respecting the matters alluded to in the question.

BOER WOMEN SENT TO THE ENEMY'S LINES.

DR. TANNER: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if any further intelligence has been obtained relative to the sending Boer women living in the territory partially occupied by the English over into the Boer lines; and whether this action has the consent of Lord Roberts, and does it apply in its integrity to Boer women whose husbands are fighting for their country; and what is the number of women so treated, and by what method of conveyance are they forwarded.

*MR. WYNDHAM: No, Sir. No information has been received.

RESERVISTS' PAY AND ALLOWANCES.

MR. SHEE (Waterford, W.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if he can state what increases have been made in respect of bounty, pay, and allowances for Army Reservists, Army time-expired Reservists, Militia, and Militia Reservists, respectively, since the beginning of the war in South Africa.

*MR. WYNDHAM: The chief increases have been in the rate of separation allowance granted to men's families, in the bounties granted to Militiamen re-engaging, and in the amount of furlough with pay to be given on demobilisation. Two new grants, as distinguished from increases to old grants, have been made, viz., the special bounty of £22 to the Royal Reservists, and the grant of half-pay to the families of men leaving Government employment to serve with the Army or embodied Militia.

SOUTH CORK ARTILLERY MILITIA—CAMDEN FORT ACCIDENT.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to the inquest held on the 15th instant upon the body of Gunner John Addis, of the South Cork Artillery Militia, who was killed on Monday by the bursting of the breech of a 40-pounder gun at Camden Fort, county Cork; whether the gun was one of four that were injured before, whether it was an out-of-date pattern and had been condemned, and whether he can state what precautions are taken to test guns before artillery practice is entered upon; and whether, in view of the circumstances of the case, the War Office will duly compensate the relatives of the deceased gunner, and also the other gunners who were wounded, one of them dangerously, upon that occasion.

*MR. WYNDHAM: No further report has yet been received in regard to this matter.

MR. FLYNN: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that I put this question down nine days since?

*MR. WYNDHAM: Yes. I have explained there has been one inquiry, and that the matter has been referred to experts on mechanical questions involved. One cannot hurry on such an inquiry.

MR. FLYNN: I want to know if any compensation is to be given to the relatives of the deceased man.

*MR. WYNDHAM: There is no provision for the widows of men killed in the service beyond a year's pay. There is compensation payable for people incapacitated by accident.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): Will the hon. Gentleman see that the

recruiting sergeants make these facts known?

[No answer was given.]

JERSEY MILITARY GARRISON.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War what is the approximate annual cost to the Imperial Exchequer of maintaining the military garrison in the Island of Jersey.

*MR. WYNDHAM: The annual cost of the troops stationed at Jersey is approximately £91,000. But the whole of this cannot be considered as an additional charge on the British Exchequer arising from the defence of Jersey. If the infantry battalion were withdrawn we should still have to pay for it, and, in addition, we should have to provide a barrack for it elsewhere.

ARMY HEAD-DRESS — SOLDIER'S DEATH AT YARMOUTH.

MR. SOAMES (Norfolk, S.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether any inquiry has been held with reference to the death of William Ward, a private in the Prince of Wales' Own Norfolk Artillery Militia, at Yarmouth, on the 18th instant, which death is alleged to have been the result of sunstroke incurred on the journey from Sheerness on the previous day; whether Ward wore the field service cap or some other head-dress on the journey; and whether the War Office has yet come to any decision with regard to the future head-covering for our troops.

*MR. WYNDHAM: This man was taken ill at 4.30 p.m. on the 17th instant while on a baggage guard at the South Town Railway Station, Yarmouth. The inquest verdict was "heat, overwork." On the journey he wore a helmet, but when working under cover at the station he wore a forage cap; he did not work in the sun at all. Inquiry will be made into the allegation of over-work. I have dealt with the question of a new head-dress in debate.

SALFORD VOLUNTEER ENGINEERS.

SIR J. W. MACLURE (Lancashire, Stretford): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether any reply has yet been received at the War Office from Major-General Swaine, commanding the North-Western Division, with reference to the formation of a Volunter engineer corps whose headquarters would be within the Salford hundred of the county of Lancaster, and whether the offers of 1,000 men suitable for service in such a corps have been received; and whether he will undertake that the inefficiency of the arrangements in the formation of engineer Volunteer corps previously should not be used as an argument against the acceptance of so large a body of men under regulations made by the War Office sufficiently stringent to guarantee efficiency.

*MR. WYNDHAM: The recommendation from the General Officer commanding the North-Western District has now been received, and the Secretary of State for War is prepared to authorise the formation of a corps of four companies of Fortress Engineers.

ALDERSHOT — RECREATIONS FOR TROOPS.

CAPTAIN NORTON: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether, seeing that the new canteens at Aldershot, shared by two battalions, have not met with general approval, he will consider the advisability of doing at home what Lord Roberts, when Commander-in-Chief in India, succeeded in doing there—namely, in making the recreation rooms more attractive by having entertainments in them instead of in the canteen, thereby encouraging a higher type of entertainment, while diminishing the temptations to drink.

*MR. WYNDHAM: The hon. Member appears to be under a misapprehension. The present design of recreation room includes a stage where entertainments can be given.

CAPTAIN NORTON: My question is whether entertainments in canteens will be discouraged in favour of those in recreation rooms.

[No answer was given.]

RECRUITING—STATISTICS.

MR. SHEE: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if he will state what numbers, respectively, of fresh recruits and time-expired Army Reservists

have joined the colours in England, Scotland, and Ireland, respectively, for the six months ended 30th June last, and what were the numbers in the corresponding period of last year.

*MR. WYNDHAM: The figures are as follows:—

Recruits.	*1899.*	*1900.*
England and Wales	13,764	22,028
Scotland	1,747	2,860
Ireland	1,923	2,343
	17,434	27,231
Re-enlisted men.		
England and Wales		19,576
Scotland.....		2,825
Ireland		2,133
		24,534

I may add that these figures do not give an accurate idea of nationality, as sometimes Irish regiments are quartered in England and English ones in Ireland.

PROMOTION BOARD.

GENERAL LAURIE (Pembroke and Haverfordwest): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether the Promotion Board is still existing under the same organisation as heretofore; whether the promotions of all officers are considered by this Board or only those of generals and field rank; whether it is now the practice of the War Office to communicate to officers the decisions at which the Board have arrived, and whether the decisions of the Board are ever re-considered; whether the fitness of each officer to command in the field is decided by this Board; and whether, after the Board have reported an officer as competent to command in the field, and when under the test of active service such officer is ascertained not to be so qualified, any re-consideration of his qualifications takes place, or whether his name is retained on the qualified list, and the opinion of the Board prevails over the test of actual experience in the field.

*MR. WYNDHAM: The Promotion Board exists under the same organisation as before. Its function is to report on colonels and lieutenant-colonels of three years standing as regards their fitness for promotion and employment. The decisions are communicated to the officers reported on when the Commander-in-Chief considers it desirable. It is open to the Board to reconsider its decisions. The fitness of each officer to command in the field is not decided by the Board, but by the Commander-in-Chief.

GENERAL LAURIE: Am I to understand that in all cases the decisions of the Board are communicated to the officers or not?

*MR. WYNDHAM: That is a matter in the discretion of the Commander-in-Chief.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Can you give the names of the members of the Board?

*MR. WYNDHAM: I think there will be no objection if the hon. Member will put down a question.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: They are very superior persons, I am sure.

ARMSTRONG'S MANCHESTER WORKS —WAGES.

MR. WOODS (Essex, Walthamstow): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that there are 120 joiners employed at the works of the firm of Sir W. G. Armstrong, Whitworth and Co., Limited, Manchester, Government contractors for guns, ammunition, etc., and that these men are paid at the rate of 36s. per week of fifty-three hours, a few only being paid 37s. 6d. per week, though the rate of wages throughout this district is 9½d. per hour, or 39s. 2d. per week of 49½ hours; whether he is aware that a deputation from the workmen recently met the manager and pointed out to him that they were not receiving the average rate of wages paid in the district, and that the manager declined to pay the same wages as other employers were paying; and whether, seeing that this is a breach of the Fair Wages Resolution of the House of Commons (February, 1891), he will cause an inquiry to be made with a view of giving effect to the terms of the said resolution.

*THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Mr. J. POWELL-WILLIAMS, Birmingham, S.): I have caused inquiry to be made into the allegations contained in the question, and I will acquaint the hon. Member with the result when it is arrived at.

WOOLWICH ARSENAL—ACCIDENT IN 1881—JAMES QUINLAN.

DR. TANNER: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if the promise to inquire into the case of James Quinlan, who met with an accident when working in Woolwich Arsenal in 1881, will be redeemed; whether he is aware that Quinlan is at present in hospital, and has never recovered from the injuries inflicted while at Government work; whether medical certificates proving the injuries Quinlan suffered from will be taken into account, and whether he can state why his pension has not been granted and his sick pay never given; and whether the case will be thoroughly inquired into and substantial compensation awarded Quinlan.

*MR. J. POWELL-WILLIAMS: A promise was given to inquire further into the case, provided sufficient details were supplied to enable it to be identified. The honourable Member has not yet supplied the necessary information. If he will do so, I shall be happy to have the case thoroughly considered.

DR. TANNER: What information does the hon. Gentleman want?

*MR. J. POWELL-WILLIAMS: The part of the factory in which he was employed, and the date on which he entered the service.

DR. TANNER: Why did not the hon. Gentleman tell me that three months ago?

DUKE OF YORK'S SCHOOL.

DR. FARQUHARSON: I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether his attention has been recently directed to the condition of the laundry at the Duke of York's School; whether he is aware that the present building and arrangements have been described by the medical officer as old-fashioned, antiquated, insanitary, and unsatisfactory, and by a War Office Committee as deficient in labour-saving appliances, and causing an atmosphere unbearable when drying or folding clothes in wet weather; and whether he will endeavour to remedy a state of matters which has been further condemned by the Visiting Committee to the Board as not in a creditable state for a Government building.

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. AKERS DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): Yes, Sir; I believe the facts to be as stated. We have hitherto been prevented from renewing the plant and from carrying out the improvements asked for by want of funds. The matter will be carefully considered with the Estimates for next year.

FRENCH SUBMARINE BOATS.

MR. HARWOOD (Bolton): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if his attention has been called to the report that during the naval manœuvres of the French fleet the submarine boats "Narval" and "Morse" went through their various trials without a hitch.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. GOSCHEN, St. George's, Hanover Square): My attention is invariably called to anything interesting and instructive in connection with foreign fleets, and which may be regarded as authentic.

H.M.S. "REVENGE" — CORDITE EXPLOSION.

ADMIRAL FIELD (Sussex, Eastbourne): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he can now inform the House of the result of the inquiry by the Ordnance Committee into the cause or origin of the explosion of cordite in the magazine of H.M.S. "Revenge," in the Mediterranean some months ago.

MR. GOSCHEN: The cause or origin of the explosion of cordite in the magazine of H.M.S. "Revenge" is still under consideration by the Ordnance Committee. On May 9th that Committee made an interim Report, in which they summarised the facts of the case, and stated that they had asked for some further information and were awaiting this and the result of certain trials that were being carried out. From the evidence then before them they were unable to assign any cause for the said explosion.

FIRST SEA LORD—OFFICIAL RESIDENCE.

ADMIRAL FIELD: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether representation was made by their Lordships to the Treasury respecting the making provision of a suitable residence for the First Sea Lord in Queen Anne's

Gate, so that he should be near the Admiralty for the better discharge of his official duties, especially in time of war; whether, on the expiration of the lease of the house recently occupied by the late First Sea Lord, the landlord was willing to renew the lease at an increased rental of only £100, and did the Admiralty submit the proposal for Treasury approval, and with what result; and, seeing that in the evidence before the Duke of Somerset's Committee of 1871, stress was laid on the importance of one or more Sea Lords residing in the vicinity of the Admiralty, whether further representations will be made to the First Commissioner of Works, and to the Treasury, as to the necessity of thus meeting the wishes of the Admiralty in this matter in the interests of the public service.

MR. GOSCHEN: It is not the custom to communicate to the House Departmental correspondence of the kind referred to. I am in agreement with the Committee of 1871, as to the importance of the Senior Naval Lord residing in the vicinity of the Admiralty, and as I stated in answer to the noble Lord the Member for Roxburgh, endeavours are being made to arrive at a settlement.

COMMITTEE ON NAVY BOILERS.

SIR U. KAY-SHUTTLEWORTH (Lancashire, Clitheroe): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he can make any statement as to the constitution of the Committee on Boilers for Her Majesty's ships.

MR. GOSCHEN: I am not yet in a position to state the constitution of the Committee in question. Many persons have to be communicated with. I may possibly be in a position to answer the question on Monday, but I cannot pledge myself to a day.

THE VISIT OF THE SHAH OF PERSIA —SUGGESTED NAVAL REVIEW.

SIR EDWARD GOURLEY (Sunderland): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether the Shah of Persia, on his forthcoming visit to Her Majesty the Queen, is to witness a Naval Review, similar to that witnessed by his late predecessor; if so, will he state whether arrangements will be made, and vessels provided, for the Members of both Houses of Parliament to take part in the procession and review.

MR. GOSCHEN: It is a misunderstanding that there is going to be a Naval Review. The Channel squadron and probably a certain number of other ships will be at Spithead for inspection by the Shah, but there will be no procession or review.

THE SAILING TRAINING SQUADRON.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether, in view of the fact that nearly nine months have now elapsed since the training squadron was put out of commission and laid up on 31st October, 1899, the Admiralty have arrived at any conclusion as to re-commissioning the squadron; if not, can he state the cause of the delay in arriving at a conclusion, and when a decision is likely to be reached; does he, in the meantime, propose to take any measures for providing the Navy with any training squadron whatever; or does he contemplate the advisability of leaving the Navy without any training squadron of any description; has he received reports showing that the captains of the Fleet are generally convinced that the sailing training squadron produces officers with qualities of excellence that cannot be obtained by any other training; if not, will he, before deciding to abolish the training squadron, take measures to ascertain the opinion of the captains, and communicate the general results of his inquiry to the House; and will he, in any case, before deciding to abolish the squadron, give this House an opportunity of discussing the matter.

MR. GOSCHEN: The Admiralty have not arrived at a final decision with regard to re-commissioning the masted training squadron. Their crews were turned over to a similar number of modern ships in which their general training is being continued. The sea training of the officers and men of the Navy is now being carried on in the sea-going ships in commission, over 200 in number. I have not received reports showing that the captains of the Fleet are generally convinced that the sailing training squadron produces officers with qualities not to be obtained by any other training; opinion in the service is much divided in this respect. It is open to the hon. Member to discuss the matter in question, should he wish to do so, when the Naval Estimates are before the House. No immediate decision is likely to be come to.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Will the right hon. Gentleman undertake not to abolish the squadron before the next Navy Estimates are introduced?

MR. GOSCHEN: I cannot give any undertaking of that kind, but I think it is highly improbable that a decision will be come to before then.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Then will the right hon. Gentleman take measures to inform himself of the opinions of the captains, as suggested in the third part of the question?

MR. GOSCHEN: It would be most unusual and undesirable for the Board of Admiralty, in forming their decisions, for which they alone are responsible, to refer to the service afloat in the way suggested. Their Lordships would, no doubt, to a great extent be guided by the opinions of experienced officers in the service, but it must remain with the Board—on whose shoulders responsibility rests, and who must necessarily have wider information as to the calls made on the Navy—to decide how far the opinions of those who have not the same information nor responsibilities can be accepted with regard to the requirements of the service.

COAL SUPPLY—RESERVE FOR NAVAL PURPOSES—PROHIBITION OF EXPORTATION OF ARMS BILL.

MR. HARWOOD: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if his attention has been called to the fact that the exports of coal from this country to France have increased during two years from 2,670,000 tons to 4,230,000 tons for a period of six months.

MR. FIRBANK (Hull, E.): I beg at the same time to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether his attention has been called to the supplies of coal which are daily being shipped to foreign countries for storage for naval purposes; and whether, as the Government are bringing in a Bill to check the exportation of arms, ammunition, and military and naval stores from Great Britain, he will consider the desirability of extending the provisions of the Bill so as to include so important a munition of war as steam coal for foreign navies.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I believe the facts as regards the export of coal are as stated. The Bill which awaits Third Reading in the House of Lords does apply to coal as well as to other naval and military stores.

INDIAN RAILWAYS—FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS.

MR. A. H. A. MORTON (Deptford): On behalf of the hon. Member for Elgin and Nairn, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether the methods of calculating the rates of interest (which were settled by the Bank of England), regarding the termination in 1884 and and 1886 of the Eastern Bengal and Scinde Railway contracts, have never been checked or investigated by the India Office; and, if no knowledge of this financial transaction is on record at the India Office, whether he will now seek to secure this information for official purposes, and also for publication.

LORD G. HAMILTON: In the cases to which the question refers the contracts prescribed that the rate of interest should be determined by the Governor and Deputy Governor of the Bank of England. As I stated on Monday last,* I have no knowledge of the manner in which they calculated the rate, and it would have been most improper for the Secretary of State for India to interfere. I do not propose to take any such steps as are suggested in the latter part of the question.

BRITISH OFFICERS IN INDIAN NATIVE REGIMENTS.

MR. STANHOPE (Burnley): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India if he can state the estimated annual cost to be incurred by the proposed addition of ninety-two European officers to Punjab and Bengal native regiments; and whether these officers will be always selected from the Indian Staff Corps, or from officers of British regiments serving their term in India, in some cases, appointed by patronage or by the Commander-in-Chief; and whether selections for these additional officers could be made from experienced native commissioned officers already borne on the strength of these Punjab and Bengal regiments.

LORD G. HAMILTON: The addition of ninety-two British officers to the Indian Establishment will involve a

* See page 865 of this volume.

gradually increasing expenditure, which it is estimated will eventually amount, about twenty-five years hence, to about eight and a quarter lakhs of rupees per annum. These officers will form an increase to the Indian Staff Corps, which is recruited partly by appointments direct from Sandhurst, and partly, under strictly defined regulations, from British regiments serving in India. The object of the measure is to increase the number of British officers in India, and this obviously would not be attained by selecting native commissioned officers.

INDIAN TRADE STATISTICS.

SIR MANCHERJEE BHOWNAGGREE (Bethnal Green, N.E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India if he will give in separate figures the value of manufactured articles and raw materials respectively which are comprised in the general headings "Export of Merchandise," and "Imports of Merchandise," in the table relating to trade at page 9 of his Explanatory Memorandum for 1900–1901.

LORD G. HAMILTON: The hon. Member will find the details for which he asks at pages 24 and 25 of the Explanatory Memorandum.

THE "KOWSHING."

SIR MARK STEWART (Kirkcudbrightshire): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if the case of the "Kowshing" has ever been submitted to arbitration; if it has been so submitted, can he state with what result; and, if not, will he explain the cause of the delay.

*MR. BRODRICK: The case has not yet been submitted to arbitration, and the delay has arisen in consequence of a difference of opinion between the Chinese Minister and Her Majesty's Government with regard to the terms of reference, which the Minister has been obliged to refer to his Government.

VACCINE LYMPH.

MR. THOMAS BAYLEY (Derbyshire, Chesterfield): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he has received information of the bacterial impurity of the vaccine lymph now or recently supplied for vaccination; whether he is aware that certain brands of lymph, including that supplied by the Local Government Board, have developed colonies of germs, rendering their use improper for vaccination; and whether he will prohibit the use of such lymphs in vaccination until freedom from contamination by them may be ensured.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. CHAPLIN, Lincolnshire, Sleaford): In reply to the first paragraph, I have received no information as to the bacterial impurity of the vaccine lymph now or recently supplied by the Local Government Board which renders its use improper for vaccination. The answer to the second and third paragraphs is in the negative.

FOOD PRESERVATIVES.

MR. LAMBERT: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if he can state when the Departmental Committee on the use of preservatives in food may be expected to report; whether he is aware that summonses are being now issued by local authorities for adding to Devonshire clotted cream a small quantity of boracic acid solely as a preservative; and whether he will communicate to such local authorities the undesirability of proceeding with prosecutions on this point until the Report of the Departmental Committee has been issued.

MR. CHAPLIN: I am informed that some delay has been occasioned by a series of experiments the issue of which will not be known for some months yet, but the Committee hope to complete their Report by the end of this year. I understand that some local authorities have recently instituted proceedings in cases such as those referred to in the question. The Local Government Board, however, have no authority to prevent such proceedings being taken, and they could not undertake to interfere with the discretion of local authorities in the matter.

MR. LAMBERT: Will the right hon. Gentleman undertake to communicate to the local authorities the fact that the Committee will report by the end of this year?

MR. CHAPLIN: No doubt the information will reach them in due course.

MR. LAMBERT: But it will have more weight if sent direct.

MR. CHAPLIN: I do not see any necessity for it.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): As this is a matter which affects Ireland, I will ask, if it be considered a reasonable request, that the Home Office should issue a circular to magistrates advising them to defer prosecutions in relation to these matters until the scientific point has been settled.

MR. CHAPLIN: I cannot give any advice to the Home Office.

DIDSBURY VOLUNTARY SCHOOL RATE.

*MR. CARVELL WILLIAMS (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that in the township of Didsbury, Manchester, a voluntary school rate is applied for by the collector of, and in conjunction with, the ordinary rates of the township, and in some cases on the same demand note; and whether the Board has taken any, and what, action in the matter.

MR. CHAPLIN: I am aware of the facts referred to in the question. The Local Government Board have made inquiry into the matter, and they informed the collector on the 24th instant that the demand note for a voluntary rate should not be sent out with the demand for a compulsory rate. I understand that in a few cases the demand for the voluntary rate was made on the same demand note as the poor and general district rate. It was done without the collector's instructions by one of his clerks, and the collector immediately stopped it.

BURNLEY MINERS—CHECK-WEIGHING CLAUSES.

*MR. STANHOPE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he has now given full consideration to the petitions presented to him on behalf of a section of the miners of the Burnley district to be relieved from their present exemption, and to be placed under the provisions of the weighing clauses of the Mines Regulation Acts; whether he has caused examination to be made into the genuineness of these petitions, showing as they do in the case of the pits in question an almost unanimous desire on the part of the underground workers to be placed under the protection of the ordinary law regulating the payment of wages calculated by weight and not by measurement; whether he has received an assurance that such an inquiry, or a ballot jointly conducted on behalf both of the employers and employed, would be welcomed by the miners themselves; and whether, seeing that the Secretary of State has the power, under the Mines Regulation Acts, to make an order enforcing the check-weighing clauses of those Acts in respect of any mine or group of mines, on being satisfied as to the feeling among the miners employed in the mines in question, he will make an order giving them the protection accorded by Parliament to miners in general.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Sir M. WHITE RIDLEY, Lancashire, Blackpool): The matter has been constantly before both myself and my predecessors, and I have again considered it very carefully. I am satisfied that the signatures to the recent petitions are genuine, but on the other hand they do not show by any means an unanimous desire on the part of the miners for the revocation of the exemptions. I am not, however, in favour of continuing the exemptions unless it is clear that it is desirable in the best interests of all parties. But the matter appears to me to be so difficult that I have resolved to direct a special inquiry to be held, at which the representatives of all persons interested can be heard.

DANGEROUS TRADES REGULATIONS —REDUCTION OF ARSENIC.

MR. TENNANT (Berwickshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether an inquiry was held in 1899 into the nature of employment in the extraction of arsenic; whether he has received a Report upon the subject; and, if so, whether it will be laid upon the Table of the House; and whether it is proposed to amend the existing special rules relating to this employment.

*SIR M. WHITE RIDLEY: I instituted an inquiry last year with regard to the

health of the persons employed in certain works for the reduction of arsenic in Devon and Cornwall. I have not yet received the final Report on this inquiry, but I gather from an interim Report made some time ago that it is not likely that the establishment of any new special rules in these works will be necessary.

MR. TENNANT: Will the right hon. Gentleman lay the Papers when the Report is completed?

*SIR M. WHITE RIDLEY: I should think there will be no objection to that.

MARINE BIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION—PLYMOUTH LABORATORY—STOCKHOLM CONFERENCE.

MR. PRICE (Norfolk, E.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether the Government made it a condition, when granting a subsidy to the Plymouth Laboratory of the Marine Biological Association, that space should be provided for the carrying on of investigation by such official bodies as the Fisheries Department of the Board of Trade; and whether any naturalist has ever been employed by the Board of Trade or other Government authority to make investigations on fishes at the Plymouth Laboratory; and, if not, will he explain on what grounds.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): In 1885 the Treasury, when agreeing to a grant to the Plymouth Laboratory of the Marine Biological Association, made it a condition "that the Council undertakes to place space in the Plymouth Laboratory at the disposal of any competent investigator deputed by a recognised authority to carry out any investigation into fish questions which the laboratory can give facilities." The Board of Trade have never employed any naturalist to make investigations on fishes at the laboratory, and they have no staff or funds to devote to such a purpose. I have no information as to what has been done by other Government authorities.

MR. PRICE: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his Department has ever consulted the council of the Marine Biological Association (a body in receipt of public money) on any subject connected with fisheries; and, if so, when and on what subject, and in particular whether the council was consulted with regard to the Bill dealing with undersized fish, now withdrawn.

MR. RITCHIE: The Board of Trade have occasionally consulted the council of the Marine Biological Association on fishery subjects. The latest occasion had reference to the question of the fisheries exhibit at the Paris Exhibition. The inspectors of the Board of Trade have on many occasions consulted the officials of the association in an informal manner. The association were not directly consulted by the Board of Trade as to the Bill dealing with undersized fish, which, however, was founded on the recommendations of the Select Committee of 1893, who took evidence from the association.

MR. PRICE: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether the Marine Biological Association was consulted with respect to the Fisheries Conference held at Stockholm last year, to which Her Majesty's Government sent several delegates; whether any delegate was selected from the staff or council of that association; and whether he will consider the advisability both of increasing the Government grant to the association to £2,000 a year, and at the same time making use of the information so paid for before entering upon restrictive legislation or international agreements with regard to fishing matters.

MR. RITCHIE: So far as I am aware the Marine Biological Association were not consulted with respect to the Fisheries Conference at Stockholm, and no delegate was selected from the staff or council of that association. The question of increasing the grant of public money to the association is one for the consideration of the Treasury. Any information or advice that may be afforded by the association will always receive careful consideration from the Board of Trade, who are most desirous of acting in friendly relation with the association.

JERSEY PASSENGER STEAMER SERVICE.

MR. LAMBERT: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that passenger steamers from Jersey to England are often delayed for two or three hours at Guernsey, and

whether he would make representations to the railway companies concerned to minimise this delay.

MR. RITCHIE: I have communicated with the railway companies concerned, and understand that the delays to which the hon. Member refers are chiefly due to the fact that the steamers in question are cargo as well as passenger vessels. The matter is not one in which the Board of Trade have any jurisdiction, but I am assured that everything practicable is done to minimise delay.

RAILWAY PASSENGERS' LUGGAGE.

SIR CAMERON GULL (Devonshire, Barnstaple): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether the railway companies have come to an arrangement as to the amount of passengers' luggage which they will allow to be carried free of charge; and whether he can state the rates which are to be charged for excess luggage.

MR. RITCHIE: The Board of Trade have not at present received any further communication from the Railway Association, and I am not, therefore, in a position to say whether the railway companies have adopted any concerted action in the matter. I have, however, seen it stated that some of them have agreed to an allowance of free luggage of 150, 120 and 100 lbs.

GREAT NORTHERN RAILWAY FARES.

MR. STEPHENS (Middlesex, Hornsey): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade, if he is aware that the daily double journey between Hornsey and King's Cross costs first class passengers about 6d., second class passengers about 4½d., and third class passengers 8d.; and whether he will endeavour to obtain a proportionate equalisation of rates in the treatment of third with the other classes of passengers.

MR. RITCHIE: I will communicate with the Great Northern Railway Company upon the subject of the hon. Member's question, and inform him of the result.

SUBURBAN RAILWAY FARES.

MR. STEPHENS: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he has information, or could procure information, to make a Return showing the comparative cost for the conveyance of first, second, and third class passengers upon the London and suburban railways.

MR. RITCHIE: No, Sir; I am afraid not. The maximum powers of charge are of course laid down by the Acts of the several companies; but the actual comparative cost of conveyance would be impossible to obtain with accuracy.

GREAT EASTERN RAILWAY—LABOUR DISPUTE.

MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he has yet approached the directors of the Great Eastern Railway Company and the representatives of the railway men, with a view to inducing them to accept arbitration under the terms of the Conciliation Act, 1896; and if not, whether he will hasten to do so, in view of the imminent danger of great public inconvenience arising from the cessation of traffic on one of the chief lines in the country.

The following questions on the same subject also appeared on the Paper:—

MR. ERNEST GRAY (West Ham, N.): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that a dispute has arisen between the directors and a section of the workmen on the Great Eastern Railway, and that a number of the men propose to hand in their strike notices early in August; and whether he can intervene, so as to avert an open conflict; and if so, under what conditions would he be prepared to act.

MR. TENNANT: To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the industrial crisis on the Great Eastern Railway; whether either the directors or the workmen have applied for the intercession of the Board of Trade; and whether he has any possible ground of intervention to avert the inconvenience to the public and the dislocation of trade which must arise from the refusal of the directors to treat with the representatives whom the workpeople have selected.

MR. RITCHIE: There are several questions on this subject. The matter has, of course, been receiving my careful attention, but perhaps the best way of

informing the House as to the present position of affairs will be to read a letter which I have addressed to Mr. Bell. The letter is as follows—

"Board of Trade,
"Whitehall Gardens, S.W.,
"July 26, 1900.

"Sir,—Mr. Ritchie desires me to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 24th inst., and to say that reading your letter together with that of the chairman of the Great Eastern Railway, which has appeared in the press, it seems to him that any difference there may be between the position taken up by Lord Claud Hamilton and yourself on behalf of the railway servants does not warrant anything in the nature of a strike, such as Mr. Ritchie sees is in contemplation, and which would be attended with the greatest inconvenience to the travelling public, especially at this period of the year. He therefore desires me to say that the first condition of any advice he may offer in connection with the dispute is that any idea of a cessation of work by the railway servants at present should be abandoned.

"With regard to the question in dispute, Mr. Ritchie observes that it is not what concessions, if any, should be made to the railway servants by the company, but how an interview between the directors of the company and their employees for the discussion of the points at issue can be secured. The chairman of the Great Eastern Railway has, Mr. Ritchie notices, expressed on behalf of himself and his colleagues their willingness to receive deputations of their employees in grades, though not collectively. Mr. Ritchie is of opinion that this is a reasonable condition to impose. It is obvious that a much more effective and useful discussion of alleged grievances can thus be secured. It also appears to Mr. Ritchie that such deputations should consist of persons freely elected by the employees, regardless of whether they belong to the Amalgamated Society or not, and that any meeting at which the delegates are elected should be a meeting summoned in such a way as not to give to it the character of having been called together under the auspices of any section of the employees.

"If the course indicated by Mr. Ritchie is adopted he cannot doubt, having regard to the declarations made by Lord Claud Hamilton, that the directors of the Great Eastern Railway will readily consent to receive and to discuss the points at issue with the delegates duly elected in the manner suggested."

I may say that I have had an interview with Mr. Bell, and I have good reason to hope that the suggestions I make will be favourably received.

LAND REVENUE RECORDS.

MR. WOODS: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General whether, seeing that the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown, given in 1864, regarding the records and documents in the Land Revenue Record Office, is thirty-six years old, and that the law appertaining to estates which have escheated to the Crown through want of ownership has been altered and simplified in the meantime by the 50 and 51 Vic., c. 53—Escheat (Procedure) Act, 1887—he will at once advise the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Woods and Forests in future to allow inspection and copies of all Court Rolls relating to manorial properties held by the Crown, on payment of the legal fees, for the convenience of legitimate claimants.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs): The passing of the Escheat (Procedure) Act, 1887, does not appear to afford any reason for altering the rules regarding inspection by the public of documents in the Land Revenue Record Office. A rule allowing to persons who are not copyholders inspection and copies of all Court Rolls relating to manorial properties held by the Crown would be objectionable, particularly as the Rolls are the records of the tenant's rather than the lord's title. The present rules appear to be proper, and in special cases such as those alluded to in the question applications for leave to inspect documents can always be made to the Commissioners of Woods, and will be duly considered.

PALACE OF WESTMINSTER—ACCOMMODATION FOR MEMBERS.

MR. HARWOOD: I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works if any progress is being made towards the promised increase of accommodation for Members of this House.

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: The vacating of Sir Reginald Palgrave's residence has set free a considerable amount of accommodation on the Terrace front, and I am having plans prepared showing how it could be utilised for the convenience of Members. The scheme shows that large and costly structural alterations are involved, such as it has never been the practice to carry out without a recommendation from a Committee of the House. I propose, therefore, at the commencement of next session to move the appointment of a Select Committee on the accommodation of the House, and to lay these plans before it.

COMMITTEE ROOMS — OUTSIDE BLINDS—VENTILATION.

MR. COHEN (Islington, E.): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether he will arrange before next summer to have outside blinds fixed to the windows of the committee rooms facing the south and the west, of which the temperature last week, during the protracted sittings of the Standing Committee on Trade, owing to the absence of outside blinds, obliged several Members to leave the committee room.

*SIR J. COLOMB (Great Yarmouth): I beg, at the same time, to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether he has had recently under consideration the question of ventilation of the committee rooms and dining rooms of this House; and, if so, whether he is in a position to make any statement on the subject.

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: In reply to these questions, I have to say that I have been giving attention to the subjects referred to, and that I propose to ask the Treasury to sanction provision in the Estimates to enable me to proceed with the improvements in the ventilation of the committee rooms by means of electric fans, in accordance with the arrangements in the rooms already satisfactorily treated. As an accessory measure, and to provide a more comfortable atmosphere, I hope to have outside blinds fitted before next summer.

NORWOOD GREEN (MIDDLESEX) POSTAL DELIVERIES.

MR. BIGWOOD (Middlesex, Brentford): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether it is possible to improve the collection and delivery of letters, which have been for so long a time defective, in Norwood Green, Middlesex; and, if it be possible, whether the Department will proceed forthwith to make the necessary improvement.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. HANBURY, Preston): The Postmaster General regrets to find that on several days recently the delivery of letters in the neighbourhood of Norwood Green was delayed owing to the illness of the postman. The service is now being worked with punctuality.

STRAW HATS FOR POSTMEN.

DR. TANNER: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if attention will be given to the supplying of straw hats in the present hot weather to postmen in lieu of the kepi, and if some alteration will be made in the present summer uniform; and can he state whether postmen are required to wear waistcoats tightly buttoned up in this weather.

MR. HANBURY: Postmen are already supplied with serge uniform for summer wear. Postmen in London are also supplied with a light summer shako. In hot weather the men are allowed to wear straw hats, though they are not a part of the official uniform. The answer to the second paragraph is in the negative.

MR. STEADMAN (Tower Hamlets, Stepney): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the order as to the wearing of straw hats in London is not general? Will he make it so?

MR. HANBURY: It is not an order; it is a permission.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): Is it true that postmen on very hot days are punished if they take their coats off and carry them on their arms? Can that not be allowed?

MR. HANBURY: I will consult the Post Office authorities as to that.

DR. TANNER: Seeing that other uniformed servants are not required to wear waistcoats, cannot the same regulation be applied to postmen?

MR. HANBURY: I said the answer to the second paragraph was in the negative.

MR. STEADMAN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that permission to wear straw hats has not been given to the postmen in the East End of London yet?

[No answer was given.]

POSTMEN'S HOLIDAYS.

MR. STEADMAN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if he can see his

way to allowing overseers to sign a special holiday sheet, instead of blocking postmen out for the better portions of the year for their holiday season.

MR. HANBURY: At all offices, where the arrangements permit it, postmen sign a separate holiday sheet, but this cannot be done everywhere without injustice to some of the persons affected or waste of force. The postmen receive their annual leave during the eight months from March to October inclusive.

SORTERS' EXAMINATIONS.

MR. T. D. SULLIVAN (Donegal, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether there is either rule or practice at present in the Post Office Department by which candidates for the position of sorter or telegraph learner in head provincial offices, who at their first examination do not gain the minimum percentage for appointment, are excluded from ever again being admitted to examination; whether a similar rule prevails in any other branch of the public service; and whether arrangements will be made in this Department, as in all other branches of the Civil Service, to admit candidates within the prescribed limits of age irrespective of previous failures at examinations.

MR. HANBURY: Where positions as sorters or learners in the Post Office service are offered as the result of open competition, competitors who have been unsuccessful are allowed to compete again so long as they are within the limits of age. There are, however, chiefly at the smaller offices, posts which are filled by nomination subject to a qualifying Civil Service examination, and persons who have received nominations, but reach such a low standard in the examination that their ultimate success is improbable, are not as a rule allowed to try again, it being in their own interests that they should at once seek more suitable employment.

THE DISTRICT MESSENGER COMPANY.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, will he state whether the District Messenger Company pays any royalty or tax to the Post Office; and, if so, what the amount of the royalty is, how it is calculated, and where the amount will be found in any accounts laid beford the House; on what ground the royalty in question is exacted from the company, and whether in pursuance of any judicial decision affirming the liability of the company to pay it; has the Post Office, since the establishment of the company, organised a special service with the special object of competing with the company; and, if so, has this special service resulted so far in a loss or in a profit to the Post Office; and will the Post Office, in view of the great and increasing use to the public of the District Messenger Company's services, consider the propriety of ceasing to exact from the company the royalty hitherto paid by it.

MR. HANBURY: The company pays a royalty on telegraph call boxes calculated at the rate of 6d. per call box, with a general royalty of £25 per annum. This royalty is exacted on account of the company's operations in the use of such call boxes being an infringement of the Postmaster General's telegraph monopoly. On the 14th of April, 1891, a decree was made by the Queen's Bench Division restraining the company from transmitting telegrams and conveying letters in violation of the exclusive privileges conferred upon the Postmaster General; and the company has since carried on business as regards telegrams and letters under the licence and authority of the Postmaster General. The company is required to pay to the Postmaster General 1d. upon each letter which it delivers, and pay over such postage to the Postmaster General. On the other hand, the Postmaster General pays to the company for services rendered ½d. per letter out of moneys voted by Parliament. The amounts paid over by the company appear in the finance accounts presented to Parliament under the heading of "Gross Receipts." They are not shown separately. The Post Office organised an express delivery service for the purpose of meeting a public want as soon as this was ascertained to exist, and the service is largely used by the public. Its establishment has not resulted in a loss to the Department, and it is believed to be profitable; but owing to its being worked in connection with the other services of the Department it is not possible to state exactly the amount of profit earned. It

is not proposed to make any further reduction in the Royalty upon call boxes, or to increase the payment made to the company for the delivery of letters.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: May I ask my right hon. friend whether he can arrange that this royalty shall appear separately in the finance account, and whether he is aware that eleven out of nineteen Cabinet Ministers are box-holders?

MR. HANBURY: I cannot say anything about the latter point, but with regard to a separate account I think a Return ought to be made to the House showing what the expenses are.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Will my right hon. friend agree to a Return if I move for it?

MR. HANBURY: I do not like to reply for the Post Office, but I should think there would be no difficulty about it.

JUNIOR CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINATIONS.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury will he explain why it is proposed to amend the rules of the Civil Service Commissioners, which provided that those who passed the Junior Civil Service Examinations could, when competing for other Civil Service examinations, deduct from their actual age any time up to five years which they may have spent in the service, so that a junior can now only deduct one year when competing for an Excise assistantship; whether he is aware that this rule would operate hardly against persons who entered the service under the old rules; and whether he will take steps to exempt from the operations of the new rule the said persons.

MR. HANBURY: The principal reason for this change was that it is considered inexpedient in the interests of the public service that anyone should become an assistant of Excise at an age exceeding twenty-three years. More than a year's notice of this change was given, as it will not come into force until July next; so that anyone interested has ample time to make his arrangements. There seems no reason for any further postponement of a desirable reform. No vested interest in the old regulations can be recognised.

CUSTOMS WATCHERS.

MR. STEADMAN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he has taken any steps to carry out the suggestions made by him with a view to increasing the wages of deserving Customs watchers after a certain number of years service; and can he hold out any hopes that such improved conditions of service will be assured to these men.

MR. HANBURY: Yes; improved conditions of service will be assured to the more deserving Customs watchers after a certain number of years service.

SCOTTISH SHERIFF COURT PROCEDURE.

MR. WALLACE (Perthshire): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate if any report has yet been received from the Departmental Committee on Sheriff Court Procedure appointed more than two years ago; and, if such report has been received, whether the Government propose to take any action on the same; and, if no report has yet been made, can he state when the same may be expected.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): The Report has not yet been made, nor can I name any definite time at which it may be expected. The reference to the Committee was a very wide one, and the constitution of the Committee is such that it can only meet during the winter months.

CARRICKMACROSS WORKHOUSE.

MR. DALY (Monaghan, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the number of admissions to the Carrickmacross workhouse during the past year, according to the report recently issued by the local board, appears to be about twice as great as the admissions to Castleblaney and Monaghan workhouses, although the valuation of Carrickmacross union is only about half the valuation of Monaghan and less valuation than Castleblaney union; whether he is aware that the admissions to the Carrickmacross workhouse during the past twelve months was about three times as great as to Clones workhouse, and that the 2,172 admissions to Carrickmacross workhouse during the year were almost entirely composed of tramps or casuals; and whether the Local Government Board inspector for

Carrickmacross district has reported on this matter and suggested any remedy; and, if not, will he ask for a report, with a view to preventing further loss to the ratepayers of Carrickmacross union by having to support a number of persons who do not belong to the district.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. G. W. BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): The figures in the first and second paragraphs are approximately correct. The Local Government Board are not aware that the admissions to the Carrickmacross workhouse during the past year were almost entirely composed of tramps or casuals, though it is probable that a large proportion of the admissions did belong to this class. The Board's inspector has made no special recommendations as to the relief to be afforded to the tramps, but the Board have issued circulars on the subject to boards of guardians from time to time, and are prepared to instruct the inspector to confer with the Carrickmacross guardians at any time in the matter should the guardians so desire.

DROMORE RIVER FLOODS.

MR. DALY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that at recent meetings of the Monaghan County Council complaints were made against the Board of Works and the Lough Erne Drainage Board in consequence of the flooding of thousands of acres of land between Ballybay, Sporthall, and Coothill, owing to the want of drainage of the river passing through these districts; and whether he will take steps to prevent a recurrence of the flooding of the districts mentioned by clearing an obstruction in the Dromore river near Tullyvin, and thus prevent a loss of the crops of the people holding land in the low-lying districts between Ballybay and Tullyvin.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: Representations to the effect mentioned in the first paragraph have already been made by the County Council to the Board of Public Works, and the matter has been investigated by that Department, who have informed the Council that as the Dromore river is not within the area of any drainage district no steps can be taken by the Board with a view to the removal of the obstruction complained of.

LIMERICK TELEGRAPH MESSENGERS.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether, seeing that the telegraph messengers of Limerick are entitled to receive one halfpenny per message on all messages they deliver, he will explain why this payment has been withheld from them during the past three months; and, will he take steps for the arrears to be paid and the rule of one halfpenny per message to be observed regularly in future.

MR. HANBURY: It is not the case that the telegraph messengers are entitled to receive one halfpenny per message on all messages they deliver. The payment made to them is already high and cannot be increased; and no arrears are due.

CAHIR POST OFFICE.

MR. MANDEVILLE (Tipperary, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether it is the intention of the Department to build a new post office in the town of Cahir, county Tipperary; and if so, when will they be prepared to commence the work of building it.

MR. HANBURY: A scheme for the erection of a new post office at Cahir is under the consideration of the Post Office, but has not yet been sanctioned by the Postmaster General. I cannot, therefore, state when the building is likely to be commenced.

DUBLIN SORTING STAFF.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether his attention has been drawn to a memorial received by the Controller, Dublin, over three months ago, from members of the Dublin staff complaining of punishments for the mis-sending of letters, alleging that the increase in mis-sending was due to insufficiency of time at roads, and the quick rate at which p.m. despatching officers have to sort correspondence, the sorting of letters on the new divisions, and asking that letter-despatching officers be exempt from sorting at the primary tables in the evening; and can he state whether the memorial has been acknowledged yet; and if so, with what result.

MR. HANBURY: The memorial was duly received and acknowledged by the Controller, Dublin. Inquiry has shown that some additional force is necessary on evening duty in the Dublin Sorting Office, and steps are being taken to afford relief. For the present extra staff is brought on duty whenever it is known that the work will be heavier than the average. The bulk of the mis-sending is found to be confined to comparatively few men, and increases when these men are on duty. No record of mis-sending is made against any officer when there is any doubt as to his responsibility.

COUNTY KILKENNY POSTAL ARRANGEMENTS.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he can explain the delay in establishing the house to house delivery of letters in the townlands of Boggan and Blanchfieldboy, county Kilkenny, and say when it will come into operation.

MR. HANBURY: A house-to-house delivery of letters once a week was commenced on the 18th of June in the townlands of Boggan and Blanchfieldboy, county Kilkenny. There are very few letters for these places, and a more frequent delivery is not at present warranted.

COAGH (TYRONE) POSTAL SERVICE.

MR. DOOGAN (Tyrone, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he has recived a further detailed statement from the residents of Coagh, county Tyrone, suggesting how the defects in their postal service could be remedied at slight, if any, cost; and, whether the Coagh memorial praying for redress, which was refused last year on the ground of expense, will be reconsidered in view of the fresh information furnished.

MR. HANBURY: The Postmaster General has received a further detailed statement from the inhabitants of Coagh, county Tyrone, suggesting how a better postal service to that place could be provided. The desired improvements, however, could not be afforded without considerable additional cost. Even if a service between Cookstown and Coagh could be provided at practically the same cost as the present service between Moneymore and Coagh, which does not seem likely, considerable additional expenditure would still be necessary in order to maintain the existing delivery to places on the road between Moneymore and Coagh; and such expenditure would not be warranted.

BUNDORAN MAILS.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether his attention has been directed to the inconvenience entailed on the inhabitants of Bundoran by the delay in the day mails from Dublin and the consequent inability to reply by evening post to letters received by those mails; whether he is aware that the Bundoran letters are sent by the 6.5 a.m. train from Dublin, viâ Portadown and Omagh; are detained at Omagh, where they arrive at 9.30 a.m., till 12.25; do not reach Bundoran till 3 p.m.; and are not delivered till 4 p.m., the time when the evening mail goes out; whether he is aware that, while an express train leaves Dublin at 9 a.m., and reaches Bundoran, viâ Clones, at 1.40 p.m., the letters for Bundoran are sent some hours earlier and reach Bundoran some hours later than the parcel post, which is sent by this train; whether letters for Bundoran could be sent from Dublin by the 6.5 a.m. train, which arrives in Enniskillen at 10.5 a.m. and be taken up by the express passing Enniskillen at 12.33, and due in Bundoran at 1.40; and whether immediate steps will be taken to secure that letters should reach Bundoran from Dublin in time to be answered by the evening post.

MR. HANBURY: These letters now arrive at Bundoran at 2.25 p.m., and are sent out for delivery at 2.50 p.m. Some persons, however, living near the end of the delivery do not receive them in time to post replies for the return mail at 4 p.m. During the summer months an express train, as stated in the question, leaves Dublin at 9 a.m., and to reach Bundoran at 1.40 p.m. This train, however, could not be used for correspondence from Omagh and other places north of Dundalk, and even if it were used for the mails from Dublin, it is doubtful whether the residents at Bundoran would

be willing that the afternoon delivery should be made before the arrival of the correspondence from Omagh, etc. The question whether a double service to Bundoran would be justified during the summer is being considered, and if that is found to be the case, inquiry shall be made as to the wishes of the residents in regard to the time of the delivery.

DRUMCONRATH POSTAL ARRANGEMENTS.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether the Postmaster General has received a memorial influentially signed by the gentry and traders of Drumconrath, asking for the establishment of direct postal communication between Drumconrath and Nobber; and whether it is intended to establish the service asked for; and, if so, when.

MR. HANBURY: This memorial has been received. It is proposed to arrange for the postman from Nobber and the postman from Drumconrath to meet every week day at Summerhill and exchange letters. By this means local letters will be available to callers at the Post Office at either place shortly after one o'clock on the day of despatch. This arrangement will be commenced at an early date.

CORK POSTAL ARRANGEMENTS.

MR. MAURICE HEALY (Cork): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether the Postmaster General has considered the memorial presented more than twelve months ago from the residents of Ashburton, Dillon's Cross, Mayfield, and neighbourhood on the north-east side of the city of Cork, to have a post office established at Dillon's Cross, the district being at present only served by a wall letter-box; and whether, in view of the fact that the nearest post office is a mile away from the greater portion of the district in question, which is one where the population is increasing and many new houses are being built, and of the inconvenience caused by the present want of postal facilities in this important and growing district, a post office will be opened there, as requested.

MR. HANBURY: No such memorial has been received. The Postmaster General has called for a report, and will communicate his decision upon it in due course to the hon. Member.

CLONES WATER SUPPLY.

MR. MACALEESE (Monaghan, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland is he aware that dissatisfaction exists among the inhabitants of Clones with the quality of the water supplied to that town; and can he say when a report upon the condition of the filter beds of this supply was received from the sanitary officer; and will he instruct the Local Government Board to send an inspector to Clones to report upon this matter, so that all apprehension as to the purity of the water may be allayed.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: No representations have been made to the Local Government Board as to the quality of the Clones water supply, and the Board are unable to say when a report upon the condition of the filter beds was received from the sanitary officer. The medical inspector of the Board has been directed to make special inquiries into the matter on the occasion of his next visit to Clones.

ROSSAVALLEY (FERMANAGH) TENANTRY.

MR. DOOGAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can explain why the tenants of Rossavalley, county Fermanagh, who purchased their holdings from Messrs. Bracken and Gordon, joint landlords, in November, 1898, have had to pay, and are still paying, half-yearly instalments to the Irish Land Commission at the rate of 5 per cent. per annum on the purchase money, whilst the tenants on the adjoining estate of the Commissioners of Education, who purchased about the same time, had to pay instalments at the rate of only 4 per cent. per annum.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: This question refers to interest in lieu of rent payable by the tenants to the vendor pending the completion of the sale, and not to half-yearly instalments of annuities payable to the Land Commission. The amount of interest payable in such circumstances is a matter of agreement between the tenants and the landlord.

IRISH PUBLIC HOUSE LICENCES.

MR. MAURICE HEALY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will arrange for an annual return of the number of new public-house licences granted and extinguished in each quarter sessions division in Ireland, showing in each case whether the new licence was granted in substitution for an existing licence.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: I would refer the hon. Member to Table 60 in the volume of Judicial Statistics (Ireland) for 1899, recently presented to Parliament, the information in which may serve the purpose he has in view. If not, perhaps he will communicate with me further in the matter.

THE BREHON LAWS.

MR. T. D. SULLIVAN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he can say whether any and what progress is being made towards the publication of the promised volumes of the Irish Brehon Laws; and whether, on account of the death in July, 1899, of the Right Rev. Dr. Graves, one of the Brehon Law Commissioners, he deems it advisable to appoint another Gaelic scholar in his place, and so expedite the work of publication, and give confidence to all who feel interested in the due preparation of the volumes.

MR. HANBURY: The Glossary, which will form Volume 6 of the series, is nearly completed, and it is hoped that it will be ready for printing, together with Volume 5, by Christmas. No special steps are therefore necessary to expedite the work of publication.

IRISH TENANCY CONTRACTS.

SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derby, Ilkeston): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Local Government Board for Ireland have yet obtained a test case to determine the question as to whether contracts of tenancy are to disqualify persons from being members of district councils whose tenants they are; and, if not, whether steps will be taken to settle the matter by a decision of the higher courts.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: The Local Government Board have taken proceedings in a case where a rural district councillor was a tenant of a labourer's cottage, but as the magistrates convicted and imposed a nominal fine the case did not come before the higher courts. The magistrates' decision in this case was communicated by circular to all rural district councils. The Board have instructed their solicitors to endeavour to obtain a test case to decide the question in the higher courts.

MEATH COUNTY COUNCIL.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can now state why the county Meath was not allowed to adopt the Staffordshire bye-law as to resignation of members of the county council.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: I am not aware whether the Staffordshire bye-law requires confirmation by any Government Department. The County Meath bye-law, in the opinion of the Irish law officers, was *ultra vires*.

FISHGUARD AND ROSSLARE RAILWAYS.

MR. MAURICE HEALY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can state what steps have been taken by the Fishguard and Rosslare Railways and Harbour Company to carry out the undertaking embodied in their agreement with the Treasury of the year 1898 to construct a direct line of railway between Cork and Fermoy; and whether a contract for the construction of the line has yet been entered into; and when work on the line is likely to be commenced.

MR. HANBURY: No steps have been taken towards the construction of this portion of the company's undertaking, and no contract has been entered into. No portion whatever of the proposed Treasury grant of £93,000 will be paid until at least half of each line (that from Fermoy to Cork, as well as that from Rosslare to Waterford) is completed, and the grant as a whole is dependent upon the whole work being completed before 1st August, 1904. The £93,000 payable to the Treasury by the company has been allowed to remain outstanding at a low rate of interest; but in view of the apparent reluctance to begin the Fermoy and Cork portion of the undertaking I propose to require the immediate payment of this sum, unless satisfactory assurance is at

once given that the Fermoy and Cork branch will be undertaken without further delay and completed before August, 1904.

CAPTAIN DONELAN (Cork, E.): Has any portion of the line been surveyed?

MR. HANBURY: I have no information beyond that I have given.

SUTTON TO CENSURE RAILWAY.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland whether he is aware that the Great Northern Railway Company have, without legal authority, removed the fence of the public road from Sutton to Censure, and constructed a railway partly on its site and partly on private land, and raised over a foot above the public road, but unfenced therefrom; and whether, seeing that the only power enjoyed by the company in regard to the highway between these points is, under their Act of 1897, to make a tramway along the public road and with the rails level with the road, the Irish Executive will take any steps for the public protection, and the vindication of the law affecting highways.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): Anything the Great Northern Railway Company have done they have done either at the suggestion or with the consent of the county surveyor, the officer of the road authority, and for the protection and convenience of the public. On the limited information in my possession it would undoubtedly appear to me that *prima facie* the provisions of the statute have not been strictly observed. I shall carefully consider all the facts.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Has a County of Dublin grand jury power to suspend the law in Ireland?

[No answer was given.]

IRISH RAILWAY AMALGAMATION BILL.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in view of the possibility of the Railway Amalgamation Bill now before Parliament, which would establish a railway monopoly over nearly three-fourths of the entire area of Ireland, becoming law, he can say whether the Government intend, and if so when, to create some tribunal, cheap and easy of access, in Ireland, other than the existing Railway and Canal Commissioners, to which Irish traders and passengers can appeal in causes of complaint in the matter of railway rates, fares, and facilities against railway companies; whether he can state what powers (if any) the Irish Department of Agriculture have to deal with such railway questions; and whether it is proposed to give to that Department the powers now possessed by the Railway and Canal Commissioners to deal with them, or in what other way the Government propose to meet the necessities of the case.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The answer to the first and third paragraphs of the question is that the passing of the Bill referred to by the hon. Gentleman will be accompanied by powers obviating the necessity for creating a tribunal dealing with the question as between the railway company and the public. The Department of Agriculture has power to appear on behalf of aggrieved persons before the Railway Commissioners, and to pay the cost out of their funds.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: What are the powers which the right hon. Gentleman says will obviate an appeal?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am afraid the hon. Member must give notice of that question. I have supplied all the information I have.

IRISH TENANTS AND POOR RATE DEDUCTIONS.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland whether the Government propose to insert a clause in the Local Government (Ireland) Amendment Act to define the rights of tenants to deduct half the poor rate from the landlord, and also a regulation to separate the poor rate from other rates on demand note.

MR. ATKINSON: If the hon. Member will refer to the Bill he will observe that the matter is already sufficiently provided for.

POTATO CROP—EXPERIMENTS WITH ELECTRICAL CONDUCTORS.

MR. AUSTIN (Limerick, W.): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture for Ireland if he can

now state what are the results of the inquiry promised regarding certain experiments made by Mr. O'Sullivan, of Athea, county Limerick, in the improvement of the potato crop by the introduction of electricity through lightning conductors distributed through the crops by means of wires, by which it was stated that an increase of 80 per cent. was shown.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOR IRELAND (Mr. PLUNKETT, Dublin County, S.): A Departmental inspector has visited Athea to make inquiry on this subject. The inspector reported that the experiments conducted last year by Mr. O'Sullivan to test the influence of electricity on the growth of potatoes were too limited in extent to warrant conclusive deductions. Similar experiments on a larger scale are, it is stated, in progress this year under Mr. O'Sullivan's direction, and will be watched with interest by the Department.

IRISH SCHOOL TEACHERS' BONUS.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether teachers of the National schools (Ireland) who, under the old regulations, were entitled to an annual bonus, will get credit for these amounts when the new salaries under the new rules are being fixed.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: Existing teachers who have hitherto been entitled to an annual bonus will get credit for the amount when the new salaries are being determined.

IRISH NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS' INCOME.

MR. MACALEESE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been drawn to a memorandum as to provisional payments of income to teachers of National schools issued in June last by the National Education Board, Ireland, in which a section of paragraph 5 laid down that if a teacher's results period did not usually terminate till the 31st May, he would be paid as the June quarter's remittance (*a*) £20, the equivalent of twelve months results fees, etc.; (*b*) two months salary, etc., up to the 31st May, 1900, at the old rate, equal to £13 6s. 8d.; and (*c*) one month's consolidated income from the 1st June, 1900, namely, £8 6s. 8d., or a total sum of £41 13s. 4d. would be remitted to him; and in the event of items (*b*) and (*c*) having been remitted in such cases and item (*a*) withheld, can he say why, and whether item (*a*) will be made good to the teachers.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: The promises contained in the memorandum referred to are being fully carried out. Payments under (*a*) take a little longer time to determine than those under (*b*) and (*c*), but all such amounts falling due in the June quarter will have been discharged about the close of the current month.

TEACHERS IN POOR LAW SCHOOLS.

CAPTAIN DONELAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can say what steps it is proposed to take to safeguard the interests of the teachers in contributory unions in view of the fact that the direct grant, now to be included in the Education Estimates, is considerably less than the results hitherto paid by these unions.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: For the future, existing teachers of National schools in unions that have hitherto been contributory will have included in their income from State sources the moneys voted by the unions. In the case of future teachers no disparity will exist.

MR. MAURICE HEALY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can now state definitely what arrangements will be made to secure that National teachers in workhouses will suffer no loss from the abolition of result fees, and that an allowance will be made to them corresponding in amount to that hitherto allowed by the guardians for result fees.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: I do not think I can add to the statement already made by me in answer to the previous question of the hon. Member, namely, that it will be open to the guardians to pay to teachers in workhouse schools a bonus equivalent to the average of the results fees for the last three years after each examination, if the report of the inspector upon the school be in every respect satisfactory

CANADIAN EXPORTS TO GERMANY.

GENERAL LAURIE: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, seeing that the Tariff Law passed by the German Reichstag, pending the negotiations for the Commercial Treaty with the British Empire, specially excluded Canada and Barbados from the most-favoured-nation treatment for their products, on the grounds that Canada and Barbados had specially given preferential advantages under their tariff laws to the British Empire, and had not admitted other countries to these advantages; whether he is aware that this discrimination against the products of Canada, which was enacted because Canada had, as above stated, discriminated in favour of the mother country, has diminished the importation of Canadian products into Germany; and whether there is any intention to offer her any compensating advantages in trade.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have no accurate information as regards the grounds on which the Government have taken action, nor as to the effect of that action on the imports from Canada to Germany. As regards the last paragraph of the question, my hon. friend is probably aware that the exports of Canada to this country are already free.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): Perhaps the Leader of the House will tell us what will be the business next week, and I would specially ask him whether the Report of the Colonial Office Vote will be taken at such a time as will permit of further discussion. Yesterday we had a short discussion, which was closured, and there was no opportunity for detailed inquiries which Members desired to make.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not think that yesterday's was a short discussion. It lasted until half-past seven o'clock, as the House knows, and was nearly as long as it would have been on the night I intended to set apart for the Vote, though on an appeal from the right hon. Gentleman I transferred the discussion to a Wednesday.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I merely mentioned that it was closured.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I thought there was some undercurrent of objection. As regards the Report stage of the Vote, there is one opportunity on which the Report of Votes can be taken at an early hour—the last day of Supply. The Government have no views as to how that day up to ten o'clock should be allocated, and I would certainly regard what may be any general wish. On Monday next the first business will be the resolution to introduce the financial proposals of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. I do not know whether the House would desire to take a general discussion at that stage or to defer it until the Second Reading stage. For various reasons I think it would be more convenient to defer discussion until the Second Reading, because I am anxious to proceed with the Companies Bill on Monday.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Will the Chancellor of the Exchequer's statement be made by resolution in Committee of Ways and Means?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that I have a very important notice down on the motion to go into Committee?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I was not aware of it, and I regret to hear it.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Mr. HALSEY reported from the Committee of Selection, That they had discharged the following Members from the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures:—Mr. Brodie Hoare, Mr. Charles M'Arthur, and Sir James Woodhouse; and had appointed in substitution: Mr. Round, Mr. Kemp, and Mr. John Wilson (Durham).

Mr. HALSEY further reported from the Committee, That they had discharged the following Members from the Standing Committee on Law and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure:—Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. H. S. Foster, Mr. Flower, and Mr. Yerburgh; and had appointed in substitution: The Lord Advocate, Mr. Loder, Colonel Milward, and Viscount Cranborne.

Reports to lie upon the Table.

MEMBERS OF LOCAL AUTHORITIES RELIEF BILL [Lords.]

Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 313.]

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Beer Retailers' and Spirit Grocers' Licences (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill, with Amendments.

That they have agreed to—Amendment to Inebriates Amendment (Scotland) Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill intituled, "An Act to Amend the Law relating to the Exportation of Arms, Ammunition, and Military and Naval Stores." Prohibition of Exportation of Arms Bill [Lords].

PROHIBITION OF EXPORTATION OF ARMS BILL [Lords].

Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 314.]

QUARRIES (RE-COMMITTED) BILL.

Order for Committee [this day] read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

EAST INDIA REVENUE ACCOUNTS.

Order for Committee read.

THE INDIAN BUDGET.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord G. HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): The statement I propose to make to the House, as those acquainted with the finances of India are aware, covers a period of three years, and the period with which I have to deal commences with April, 1898, and terminates in April, 1901. In two out of those three years a drought of unparalleled dimensions, intensity and duration has upset the normal finances of the year, and inflicted terrible sufferings on a large portion of the population of India. I believe the House takes more interest in the cause of this abnormal affliction than in the ordinary prosaic comparisons between the revenue of different years. So I propose to devote a considerable part of my statement to describing the extent, progress, and future prospects of this terrible calamity. It is the practice in this country always to designate an affliction of this kind by the word "famine." But I do not think that word, although perhaps it may be the best word in our language, quite accurately designates the primary cause of an affliction of this character, and certainly does not convey to those who read about famine all the consequential evils entailed by drought. As the House is aware, India is one of the most purely agricultural countries in the world. Eighty per cent. of the population are usually engaged in agriculture, and agriculture in India, as elsewhere, is dependent on rain. But rain only falls at certain periods, and during the rest of the year a condition of more or less heat prevails. If rain fails during the periods when it ordinarily falls drought obtains possession of the area not touched by rain, and not only is there a lamentable curtailment of food supply to those living in the localities where there is no rain, but all means of earning wages ceases. It is very difficult to bring home to those of us who live in a densely populated country like Great Britain, where occupations are so diversified and varied and independent of climatic conditions, what terrible industrial paralysis the failure of the monsoon causes to those districts in India which are not adequately watered. The supply of food is almost the least of the difficulties with which the Indian Government have to contend. There is always a sufficiency of food in the great continent of India, even in years of drought. Owing to the increase of communication and the development of railway enterprise that food can with greater ease be carried to the districts which are distressed. The real difficulty is that of distribution and the supervision of distribution. Cattle are the only means of transport in rural India. In a period of drought vegetation ceases and cattle die. The number of officials at the disposal of the Indian Government is limited, and it is absolutely impossible to organise a system of supervision of distribution which would enable food to be brought to the multitudinous villages, and consequently it becomes necessary to take people from their villages and aggregate them in various places where supervision may be exercised and distribution of food may be made effective. Therefore the House should bear in mind that when a calamity of this kind occurs it is not merely that people are deprived of their crops, but all means

of earning a livelihood disappear, vegetation ceases, their cattle die, and to keep them alive it is necessary to have recourse to the dislocation of the whole system of village and agricultural communities in India. All these difficulties the people in the distressed districts have borne with consummate patience and resignation, and I am glad to say there has been a remarkable absence of crime throughout the great majority of these districts. The House may perhaps like to know what are the dimensions of the present famine. Taking the most accurate data we have of the last three serious droughts, we find that in 1876 the area affected was 205,000 square miles and the population 36,000,000. In 1896 the area affected was 275,000 square miles and the population 52,000,000. This year I am sorry to say the area affected beats the record. It is 420,000 square miles and contains 62,000,000 of people. I am sorry to say the intensity and duration of the drought within that area is greater than in preceding droughts. The number of people on relief works in the last great drought on 1st January was 636,000. This year on 1st January the number was 2,750,000. On 14th July, in the last drought, the number in receipt of relief was 3,300,000; the number at the same time this year was 6,100,000. Now if we dismiss temporarily from our minds the enormous aggregate mass of suffering, both physical and mental, that this affliction has imposed upon the localities it has touched, and look simply at the material loss which these localities have sustained, the figures assume most serious dimensions It is very difficult to get accurate agricultural statistics as regards the edible crops, because a large proportion is consumed in the districts producing them, but we have more accurate statistics relating to the great agricultural exports, and I take these as an illustration of the loss which the country has sustained, putting on one side all other considerations. The wheat crop in a normal year is estimated to amount in value to £21,000,000. This year I am informed it cannot be more than £10,000,000. There is a loss in that one particular crop of £14,000,000. The cotton industry employs a larger number of persons than any other industry except agriculture. I mean not only in the cultivation of cotton, but also in the processes of manufacture, and the cotton industry largely depends upon the supply of raw material from Indian sources. The value of the cotton crop in a normal year is £12,000,000. This year it cannot be more than £5,000,000. Another very lucrative crop is that of oil seeds. The average value of that crop is not less than £18,000,000. This year it has disappeared altogether outside the Northern Provinces. I am informed on reliable authority that the reduction in the harvest in Bombay cannot be put at less than £15,000,000, excluding the frightful loss in cattle. Notwithstanding these tremendous losses, so large is India, so variable is its climate, and so unfailing is the law of compensation—that which is to the detriment of one province being very often to the benefit of another—that if we had only had to deal with one year's drought, I should, from the financial point of view, have been able to lay before the House an eminently satisfactory statement. But I am sorry to say that the reports of the last few days have not been at all satisfactory as regards the position of the monsoon, and we cannot dismiss the possibility that there may be a partial failure of the monsoon this year. Before I deal with the accounts, I may perhaps point out to the House that they are now stated in sterling; previously they were stated in tens of rupees. In the time of the East India Company the rupee was converted at 1s. 10½d., but in 1857-58 the exchange value was altered to 2s., a most convenient figure, introducing an unauthorised kind of decimal coinage. In the course of time the rupee steadily fell in value, and the difference between the nominal and the actual value became so great that it became necessary to alter the form of the accounts, and we took to stating the transactions in tens of rupees. That practice continued for some little time, but as during the past two years the exchange value has scarcely vaied fromr 1s. 4d. the Government in September last declared a gold standard in India, and we thought it a favourable opportunity to state all transactions in pounds sterling at the rate of 15 rupees to the pound. The first year I have to deal with is 1898-99. I estimated last year a surplus of £2,700,000; the actual surplus realised was £2,640,000. For the year 1899-1900 the Finance Minister estimated a surplus of £2,600,000. He anticipated a normal year and made no special provision for famine. During the year a very

heavy expenditure has had to be incurred in connection with the famine, and very large remissions of revenue have also had to be made. These in the aggregate amount to very nearly £3,500,000. But the whole of that amount is not an additional charge against revenue. Every year there is included in the expenditure a certain sum which is allotted to famine. If no famine occurs, that money is used either in constructing protective famine works, or in reducing the debt. In the year in question £730,000 was so available, and that has been used for the purpose of direct famine relief. Therefore the amount of additional charge caused by the famine is only £2,631,000. That, of course, is a very large deduction from the original estimate, but I am glad to say that we have had certain windfalls, and certain branches of revenue show such an improvement that I have more than a corresponding balance to show on the other side. Army expenditure is much less in consequence of the European contingent which has gone to South Africa. The railways have given a very good return, nearly half a million in excess of the Estimate. Telegraphs also show a large increase, and the gain on revenue generally is nearly £1,400,000. Adding to this reductions in expenditure we get a gain on the Budget of last year of £2,870,000, and putting that against the loss caused by the famine, the first year of famine expenditure, after paying all expenses connected with the famine, closed with the substantial surplus of £2,800,000. That put us in a position of exceptional financial strength for dealing with the famine expenditure of this year. When, therefore, Mr. Dawkins had to balance the expenditure and the income for the year, he estimated that he might safely rely upon a normal monsoon for this year, a monsoon which would be adequate in its volume and effective in its distribution. Inasmuch as it was the west of India that was affected by this drought, parts which had not for a century known lack of rain, his estimate seemed to be a prudent one, and one upon which we thought we might safely rely. But I am sorry to say that during the past ten days the accounts of the behaviour of the monsoon have not been at all satisfactory, and I am afraid that we must contemplate a very considerable expenditure over and above that which the Indian Government estimated in March last. For this year, after all the expenditure and all the loss of revenue inflicted on the Government of India by drought, they thought they might rely on a surplus of £160,000. About eight days ago I got the revised account. The monsoon had then broken well, and the Indian Government thought t would not be necessary to make any much larger provision than they included in the original estimate, and they informed me that they thought the surplus for this year would be about £50,000. Now the monsoon was very late this year. In recent years the Meteorological Department have established a direct connection between the fall of rain in India and the height of the Nile flood in Egypt. For the last twenty years, when there has been a failure of rain in India, the Nile flood has been low. Last year the flood was one of the lowest on record, and the failure of the monsoon was exceptionally bad. This year the Nile flood was normal, and that inspires the hope that ultimately the monsoon will fulfil its normal course. But on Tuesday night I received a telegram from the Viceroy in which he stated that after consulting with the Finance Department, he had come to the conclusion that it would be necessary to provide for an additional £1,200,000 for famine relief and the remission of land revenues. So that, instead of a surplus of £160,000, a deficit of £826,000 is now contemplated. I will read a telegram from the Viceroy, which states the facts upon which this estimate of increased expenditure is based. It is dated Simla, 25th July, 9 a.m.—

"Since my famine telegram to you of 20th July, conditions have changed decidedly for worse. No rain has since fallen in the Punjab, Sind, or Gujerat; insignificant rain in North Western Provinces, Bombay, Deccan, and Rajputana. On West Coast ordinary monsoon current has failed, and there are no present indications of revival. It is, therefore, not impossible that we may be faced, at any rate in Gujerat, Kathiawar, Baroda, and South-West Rajputana, with a far more serious situation than has yet arisen, while should monsoon continue to hold off a large part of India may be in for a second consecutive year of famine."

Then Lord Curzon, with his characteristic vigour, adds—

"I am going down myself on Monday to Gujerat to spend a week in the distressed districts and personally inspect the state of affairs."

The Viceroy and Lord Northcote will consult together, and before the end of

the week we shall no doubt have a further report of the state of affairs. I have now a telegram from the Governor of Bombay of the same date as the Viceroy's telegram, but despatched at 4.15 p.m. As he is much nearer to the distressed area, we may assume that this telegram is some twenty-four hours later than Lord Curzon's—

"Your telegram, 21st July. Rainfall has been generally sufficient for agricultural purposes in Surat and Southern Gujerat States. Some rain has fallen in part of Broach, where cotton sowings being actively prosecuted; but more rain is urgently required in Kaira, Ahmedabad, Panch Mahals. Rain not sufficient for agricultural purposes except in a few places. Two-and-a-half inches of rain have fallen since yesterday, Godhra, Panch Mahals; one in several parts Ahmedabad; over half an inch in parts Kaira; rain sufficient in parts Baroda, adjoining Surat; no rain anywhere in Okhamandal division, Baroda; rainfall to date insufficient in the remainder of Baroda, where extensive failure of crops inevitable unless good rain falls in a few days."

The area most severely threatened is a part of Bombay known as Gujerat, the richest and most fertile of the provinces of Western India, and for 100 years it has not known what drought is. It is a great cattle-breeding district and a country where the people to a large extent live upon a milk diet. We have in that part of the country only four small collectorships, and these are exceedingly difficult to administer, because they are inhabited by a great number of the non-Aryan aboriginal tribes, who are not easy to manage in times of drought. They are surrounded by native territories, which have not the same supplies and efficiency of administration as in our territories, and they are liable to be flooded with fugitives from the distressed native territories. There are four districts, and in the first rain has fallen; in the others rain is required. The Governor of Bombay's telegram proceeds as follows—

"No rain worth mentioning has fallen in any of the districts of Kathiawar, excepting small area south-east, where also more rain is urgently needed. Cultivation at a standstill for want of rain in almost the whole province. No signs of rain. Season is far advanced for sowing jowar staple cereal, but bajri can be still mostly substituted for jowar. Still time for cotton. Cattle dying from starvation. Scarcity of water increasing day by day."

This refers to the northern portion of Gujerat, which has suffered exceptionally, and where the death-rate for June has increased by nearly one-half over the death-rate for May. As regards ways and means, I propose to raise a loan of £3,000,000. For some time past I have made arrangements for inviting applications, and these will be asked for on Friday next. It will be part of the unexpended balance of the borrowing powers which I obtained three years ago. I assumed at that time that the greater portion of it would be spent in the next two years; but our finances have been so good that I have still £9,000,000 unexpended. After consultation with my advisers, I am of opinion that I shall be able, with that and other resources, to meet any demands which the Viceroy or the Government of Bombay may make between now and the end of October. even assuming that the rainfall this year is a partial failure. If the rains are propitious the loan will cover the requirements for the whole financial year. But, of course, there may be difficulties. We may not be able to make available our existing credit; and in that case we shall appeal unhesitatingly to the British Treasury. I have always held that where life can be saved by expenditure the whole financial resources of the Indian Government must be utilised; and that if, owing to untoward circumstances, we are unable to utilise our credit, Her Majesty's Government will in that case come to her assistance.

MR. MACLEAN (Cardiff): Will that be a free grant?

*LORD G. HAMILTON: The hon. Member must not anticipate. In dealing with the complicated conditions of this famine it is impossible for me now to anticipate the exact shape which that assistance ought to take. My hon. friend is under the impression that the Indian Government have been somewhat curtailed in their expenditure by desire for economy. I have had a table prepared of the total amount which the famine has cost India, and of the ways and means which we have, without any financial embarrassment, been able to apply to meet this exceptional expenditure. There has been spent, or provision has been made for spending, £6,190,000 in direct relief. Remission of land revenue and other reductions amount to £3,473,000. Loans to Native States for the purpose of meeting the famine have been £2,347,000;

and advances to individuals have amounted to £1,098,000. That is an aggregate disbursement on the part of the Indian Government of upwards of £13,100,000 sterling in two years. Nobody who realises the magnitude of these figures can say—as has been said in some quarters—that there has been an attempt to run this famine on the cheap. No demand of the Government of India or of Bombay has been refused; we have complied with every requisition, and shall continue to do so as long as the object is the saving of life. Let us see how far success or failure has attended our efforts. A very considerable portion of the area now affected by drought was similarly affected three years ago; and any one who did not very carefully study the consequences and effects of the Indian drought and famine would naturally suppose that the mortality would be higher in the districts which had been twice affected than in the districts affected for the first time. But, curiously enough, exactly the reverse is the case. In 1897 the Central Provinces, which suffered for the first time, were terribly afflicted by scarcity, and there was a heavy mortality. This year they have been even harder hit, and there is a larger proportion of the people on relief works. But, except for those districts where epidemics have broken out, the mortality has been low. The conclusion at which I have arrived from a careful study of the famine of 1896-97, and from my previous experience of the famine of 1874, is that the first essential of successful famine administration is to get the people to come in early to the relief works, when they are still in good physical condition. If that is done, then it is easy enough; but if, on the other hand, from various reasons, the people will not come on the relief works until the last stage of exhaustion and inanition, their vitality is so low that it is almost beyond the powers of the authorities to revive them. They bring with them the germs of disease, which they communicate to healthy persons who are engaged on these works. Almost all the criticisms which have been hostile to the administration of famine relief have been devoted to the conduct of famine affairs in the province of Gujerat, which has not been afflicted by famine or drought for nearly a hundred years. The mortality in Gujerat has been exceptionally high. It has been a source of the greatest solicitude to myself, Lord Northcote, and the Viceroy. I have been in almost daily communication with them on the subject, but it is exceedingly difficult to put your finger on any mistake or error which has been made. The expenditure per unit there on relief is higher than in any other part of Bombay. The works there are more numerous, and the number of additional officers drafted there is higher than in any other part of Bombay. The collection of the land revenue has been almost infinitesimal. Undoubtedly the result, so far as mortality is concerned, is not satisfactory. In the past whenever famine operations are over it has been the practice to appoint a commission of inquiry for the purpose of investigating the various methods adopted. We shall have recourse to this procedure when this famine is over, and I hope that the collection of facts and the expression of opinions may be of use to the officials of the locality in dealing with subsequent outbreaks. But the difficulties which the local officers have to contend with are enormous and almost indescribable. I saw a report of the origin of the terrible outbreak of Asiatic cholera which suddenly occurred at the capital of one of the provinces. An American gentleman, the editor of a newspaper, published an account of what he saw in the *Times of India*. For many years he had devoted himself to charitable work, and he was a very competent authority to express an opinion as to the enormous difficulties which the relief officers have from time to time to cope with. There was great distress in the native States, and it was necessary, therefore, that some works of a certain size should be put up for the purpose of giving employment. In the middle of April a large tank work was opened in Godhra to meet the case of thousands of starving people from the outlying districts outside our own administration. Here is the account which appeared in the *Times of India*, and perhaps the House will excuse me reading it, but I do so because it will enable hon. Members more fully to appreciate the almost insuperable difficulties which these officers had to contend with—

"The story of the cholera outbreak in Godhra is ancient history, but it is worth retelling. In the middle of April the big Kanelao tank work was opened in the im-

mediate vicinity of Godhra town to meet the case of the thousands of starving people flocking in from the outlying districts. The rush to this upset all calculations, and by the 20th of the month over 11,000 were crowded on to a work intended for only half that number. The administrative machinery broke down under the strain. . . . The people came hungry and resourceless; and hungry and resourceless they had to remain. . . . The receding waters of the tank confined within a limited space an enormous number of fish, and, deprived of other food, the starving people threw themselves upon this unwholesome diet and washed it down with the foul and putrid fluid in the tank. A great rise in the mortality gave rise to suspicions of cholera, and on the 20th one case was detected. On the 21st there was a lull; on the 22nd the storm broke, and 200 dead bodies lay about the camp. The ensuing panic was indescribable. The people gathered up their loins and fled from the unseen terror."

It is a sad tragedy, but no one can blame the officers on the spot for not accurately forecasting the actual number of persons who flocked in from territories not our own. Although there was a terrible mortality among those receiving relief, it was not confined to them—

"The wife of Mr. Cooper, the superintendent of the work, was struck down, and since then both Mr. Cooper and his little child have fallen victims to the disease."

It is a sad incident, only typical, however, of what was going on in other districts. All over the distressed districts our officers are combating these great evils with the greatest courage, success, and patience. In proportion to their numbers many have fallen victims to death uncomplainingly, believing that their work was appreciated by those with whom they came in contact, and quite confident that their fellow-countrymen at home will not be harsh or unfair critics of their action. Of all the men who visited those works no one was so competent to express an opinion as Dr. Klopsch, the American gentleman to whom I have alluded. After a visit to those works he wrote a final letter to the newspapers, in which he gave expression to these views—

"The more I see of the stupendous Government relief undertaking, the less I feel competent to criticise. With the limited number of intelligent workers at the Government's disposal it is a marvel that so much is being accomplished, and on the whole so well done."

It has been pointed out by hon. Members that in their judgment my action is inconsistent, inasmuch as I appealed to the Lord Mayor and the public for funds to combat the famine, but at the same time I have not asked the Imperial Treasury to give a grant for that purpose. Hon. Gentlemen who have not given a close study to the principles of famine administration in India say that the fact of appealing to the public shows that the task is beyond the control of the Government, and that if this is the case we should frankly say so and come for aid to the Imperial Government. Those criticisms imply a very limited knowledge of the methods and the machinery which we employ in connection with famine administration. Many years ago, when the organisation was not systematised for the purpose of dealing with famine, money was subscribed by the public. Practically it was applied to the same objects as Government disbursements, and the result was that there was a great deal of overlapping, and distress did not get the full benefit of the money which was raised for relief. In 1878 the celebrated Famine Commission was appointed, of which Sir Richard Strachey was chairman. It had one of the most difficult administrative tasks which was ever laid before any body of men. There is no permanent poor law in India at all; it does not exist. But India is subject to periodical visitations that contract and expand with exraordinary rapidity. At one time drought may cause temporary distress; a few weeks afterwards it may sweep the whole province and deprive the people of the means of obtaining food. What that Commission had to do was to improvise a system of poor relief so thorough and elastic that it could be applied to all these various phases of famine. They laid down elaborate regulations the principal of which was that the Government of India took upon itself the obligation of finding food for all and work for those who were unable to obtain it, and to supplement this system of relief by kitchen poor-houses and hospitals. In fact, they were to take upon themselves as regards relieving distress a higher and wider obligation than was ever undertaken by any civilised Government in Europe. If the Government of India took all these duties on itself, was there any sphere of action for private charity and benevolence? The Commission emphatically replied in the affirmative; but they said that if an appeal is made to the public that appeal must be an authorised appeal of the Secretary of State and the Viceroy, and it must be arranged that

every one subscribing will see that the money he gives is not in deduction of the Government aid, but in addition to it, and that the work of private charity shall be in clearly defined spheres of action, separate and distinct, and in addition to that which the Government undertakes. It is on that ground alone I appealed to the public, and not because we were unable to fulfil all the obligations we had undertaken of ourselves. It was because I wanted charity and benevolence to co-operate with us in that work that I appealed to the public, for in every country in the world such work is done by philanthropic co-operation. The object for which this money is asked is not work which the Government can undertake. There are four objects. First, to supplement the dole or the ration which the Government gives by special comforts in the shape of clothing or food. This is a work of discrimination, and it is impossible for the Government in the case of the enormous number of persons who come on the relief works to attempt that individual discrimination. The second object is to try and get together committees of all religious denominations, and through the instrumentality of these committees to get at the people who from caste and other reasons decline to participate in any system of public relief. The third object is to give special attention to orphans, and the last is to make advances to the cultivators of the soil to enable them to commence agricultural operations again. That last burden we have put on the shoulders of the Indian Government, because it seemed to us to be a proper and legitimate function for them to discharge, and we have practically, during the past year, devoted something like £1,100,000 to that purpose, relieving to that extent the charitable funds, and consequently enabling them to devote their attention exclusively to other objects. It is said that after all Indian Government aids and disbursements are regulated by the state of their finances, that India is poor, and that her poverty regulates the expenditure on famine, but what really regulates famine expenditure in India is the Famine Code. That Code makes provision for every conceivable contingency, and the two extreme principles upon which it is founded and which regulate its action are on the one hand that money should not be wasted, and that relief should be given in such a way as not to prevent the people going back to their normal occupations, and the second principle that wherever life can be saved by expenditure there expenditure is to be incurred. As far as the relief of famine in India is concerned, the whole financial resources, the whole administrative machinery, are at the disposal of those who are combating this terrible evil, and it is only in the event of our being unable to give effect to the regulations which we have deliberately laid down that we shall appeal for help or assistance elsewhere. May I just say a word to many hon. friends on both sides who, actuated by the most philanthropic motives, are desirous that the Imperial Government should, as an indication of sympathy and having regard to the safety of the people of India, contribute a large sum from the Imperial finances to help the Indian Government in their task? I quite admit that conditions may arise under which we may be brought face to face with facts which would necessitate such assistance on a large scale, but I for one have been brought up to believe that if you want to encourage effective economy in India, if you want to ensure financial reform, one of the primary conditions is that you must make Indian finance as far as possible independent and self-supporting. We live in a time when public expenditure is the fashion. There seems to be no class of expenditure to which a large portion of Members of the House are not ready to give their assent, and it is a very hard task when there is this craving for expenditure for the Chancellor of the Exchequer in England, with the taxpayer at his back, to stop this growth of expenditure and to prevent it advancing by leaps and bounds. There is no more unpopular and unpleasant task which any man can undertake than that of checking the demands so constantly falling upon him. In India there is just the same pressure; but if the Minister of Finance in India is consistent in trying to keep down expenditure, because he knows he must balance his income and expenditure, it is his duty to establish an equilibrium between the income and the disbursements of the Indian Government. It is nearly twenty-seven years ago since I first went to the India Office as Under-Secretary of State. My chief, who was the

Financial Secretary at the India Office, was one of the ablest officials in the public service. We soon became friends, and we agreed on this, that the only hope of effective economy, the only hope of improving the financial system, was to make India independent and self-supporting. What inducement would the Finance Minister in India have to endeavour year after year to balance income and expenditure if he knew that there were a large number of Members in this House who were prepared to press the Chancellor of the Exchequer to give a large contribution to Indian finances. Therefore, if I have objected to and opposed premature proposals to the Imperial Exchequer it is not because I have not sympathy with the sufferings of the Indian people, but because I believe the course I have adopted is for the truest well-being of India. I feel that a sound system of finance is a convertible term for the improvement of the material and industrial products of the country. I believe that as soon as this cloud passes we shall be able to make considerable remissions of taxation and so to improve and ameliorate the general condition of the taxpayers. But I admit that this policy must be conditional upon the establishment between the Imperial Exchequer and the Indian Exchequer of an absolutely just principle as regards the apportionment of the charges in which the two Exchequers have a common interest, and that naturally brings me to the very elaborate Report, delivered after years of investigation, which Lord Welby's Commission have drawn up. In this House it is the fashion with a good many of my friends on both sides to accuse the representative of the India Office with taking an optimistic view of Indian finance. My facts and my figures are not the result of mere official optimism. We had a Commission consisting of men of the highest authority, who have spent their whole lives in examining questions of finance, and some of whom have been intimately associated with the Treasury here. What are their main statements? They say first that the financial machinery of the Indian Government is well organised and effectively controlled. Then they go on to say that though the growth of expenditure has exceeded the normal growth of revenue, this was mainly due to the increased cost of exchange due to the fall in value of the rupee, and that, except for this fall, a considerable reduction of taxation might have been looked for. They further say that during the past forty years the unproductive debt of India had been reduced 25 per cent., that the commercial services, the telegraphs and post-offices, were worked at a considerable profit, and that the railway and irrigation works, with their far-reaching benefits, entail but a very slight cost. And lastly they say that the apportionment of charge between the United Kingdom and India as regards matters in which they have a common interest has on the whole been equitable and fair. If, then, we take a more sanguine view than our critics, it is because we have our hand on the pulse of Indian finance. We know its vitality, and we are not unconscious of its weakness; but, as the Commissioners point out, if we can stop this fall in exchange, if we can in any way ensure anything like stability in exchange, I am perfectly positive it will be possible in future to make considerable reductions in taxation. Not only so, but you would offer the strongest inducements to capitalists in this country to make investments in India. It is often assumed in connection with this question of exchange that we have adopted a currency policy for the benefit of a few individuals. That was not the opinion of the chairman of the Commission. The question of exchange is indeed the key of the situation. If we can keep up present prices we not only hope to reduce taxation in India, but also to offer inducements to capitalists to invest in that country, thereby assisting its resources. The Commission suggests practically that a certain sum should be transferred from one Treasury to the other; and they assume that if this sum is so transferred, the arrangements between the two Governments will in future be practically equitable. Taking the proposals in their entirety, the amount which they propose should be transferred, and charged from one Treasury to the other, is £257,000. I have been in communication with the various Departments concerned, and with Lord Curzon. The Government wish to give the most favourable consideration to these proposals, and we hope that in the course of a few months we shall be able to make arrangements whereby a sum of £250,000, or thereabouts, shall be transferred as suggested, and India to that extent will be

benefited. At the same time, I am bound to guard myself by saying that I do not necessarily bind myself to accept all the detailed proposals of the Commissioners. I naturally pass on from Lord Welby's Commission to the work we have done during the past year in connection with our object of establishing a gold standard associated with a limited gold currency. What did the experts tell us? We always like to consult experts. I think it is often pleasant to hear them talk; but the real satisfaction is when a number of experts have irretrievably committed themselves to a proposition which subsequent events show to be wholly and utterly false. The experts on this occasion who were opposed to our policy all told us that we might be able to establish a gold standard by proclamation in India, but as to associating with that a gold currency or getting any amount of gold flowing into India it was an absurdity. The gold, they said, would gradually filter back by process of exchange or trade. It was absurd, so they alleged, to think that any sensible person would take to India gold which had an even exchange in value all over the world in order to exchange it for rupees whose monetary value decreased 40 per cent. when taken outside India. The famine, to which I have so frequently alluded, caused a great falling off in the export trade of India; war broke out in the Transvaal, the world was deprived of its largest source of gold supply, and in consequence of the war expenditure the price of money rose. I do not think I am exaggerating when I say that if the Committee of which the right hon. Gentleman was chairman could have foreseen that in the first year after they concluded their report conditions so unfavourable to the realisation of a gold standard and currency in India would have existed, they would not have wanted action to be taken until a normal state of things had been re-established. Yet, notwithstanding this rare combination of influences against us during the past year, so far from gold not going to India there has been a super-abundance of gold there. I do not like to trouble the House needlessly with figures, but this is really so interesting a matter that perhaps I may be allowed to read a few. There is a very large note circulation in India, and a considerable portion of this note circulation is covered by Government securities, the remainder by coined metal, either rupees or gold. The rupee is valued in exchange at 1s. 4d., or at the rate of 15 rupees to the sovereign. In January, 1899, the note issues secured by metal were 15 crores 67 lakhs; against that was held silver, 15 crores 19 lakhs; gold, 48 lakhs. In October silver had fallen to 12 crores 36 lakhs, and gold had risen to nearly 5½ crores. In January this year silver had fallen to 6 crores 78 lakhs, and gold had risen to about 10½ crores. At the end of May, of the notes for 18½ crores secured by metal, only 4½ crores were represented by silver; 14½ representing gold. We were in consequence obliged to buy silver and coin it to exchange it for gold. We have been compelled to buy £1,900,000 of silver, sufficient to coin 440 lakhs. About 1,689 lakhs of rupees, or £11,200,000, have been added to the rupee circulation since 1st April, 1899. I think we shall have to watch very closely this addition to the currency, but still I congratulate the right hon. Gentleman the Chairman of the Committee on the singular success which has attended its recommendations. We have got over the initial difficulty of the currency reform, and I hope that with the exercise of patience and vigilance we shall in measurable time have accomplished the objects we have in view. Sir E. Law reports that there was a large profit on the coinage of the silver, and in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission, he proposes to appropriate that to a special reserve fund which will facilitate our currency operations. I am afraid I have detained the House a long time, but there are a great many Amendments on the Notice Paper, and no doubt I shall be able to deal in reply to them with various other subjects of interest. There is only one other item of expenditure on which I wish to say a word or two—Army expenditure. The cost of military equipment seems to me to have almost escaped the control of the different Governments of the civilised world. I often wonder whether the great military Powers when they forced all the men of their nations into arms foresaw the result which would follow. The result has been that there has been such a demand for the manufacture of arms and munitions of war that their manufacture has become a most profitable undertaking. In the old

days Governments for the most part manufactured their own arms and munitions; now there are great syndicates for the purpose controlled by men of the highest scientific attainments and genius, great chemists, great financiers. All the modern processes of production and industrial organisation are combined for the purpose of making more deadly weapons with which men may kill one another. The whole resources of civilisation are ransacked to obtain more and more effective weapons of warfare. The result is that the improvements are so great that it almost involves a change every decade. No Government can stand aside and allow its army to be armed with weapons which are a few years old. To such an extent is the manufacture of arms pushed that it has destroyed the difference which used to exist between the barbarous and semi-barbarous and the civilised Powers. The civilised Powers used to keep back barbarism by the superiority of their arms and weapons, but now these great syndicates are prepared to provide barbarous nations with arms of the most modern type, provided they can pay for them. In these circumstances the Government of India have no option but to see that our men are equipped with the most modern weapons. An illustration of what has occurred may be found in China to-day. Our native army in India until recently was armed with the Martini rifle. We thought it necessary that they should have the more modern weapon, and we were able, with the assistance of the War Office, to arm a considerable portion of the native army early in this year with Enfields. Some of these troops are under orders to China; and had it not been for this increased expenditure this year, these troops would have been sent to China with less effective weapons than those possessed by the Chinese. I regret that we have to incur this expenditure, but it is inevitable. The sums which have been paid by the British Government on account of the contingents to South Africa and China will to a very large extent cover the expenditure. In certain quarters it is suggested that, because the Indian Government in exceptional circumstances have allowed a certain numberof the troops of their establishment to go to South Africa and China, the Indian establishments must be in excess of the requirements. The emergency, however, was in both cases altogether exceptional, and the Indian Government were perfectly justified under the circumstances in doing what they did. Because in abnormal circumstances we ran a risk, it is unreasonable to suppose that when affairs return to a normal condition we should still continue to run that risk. Therefore, I can hold out no hope whatever of a reduction of military expenditure. I think, if anything is done, we may have slightly to increase it That is not due to any wish to extend our territory, or to adopt any aggressive policy. During the last year Lord Curzon has shown great energy and determination in seeing everything for himself; he has passed all along the frontier. Two principles have been laid down for the regulation of our North-West Frontier policy. One is the substitution of levies and local Militia for British Indian troops, and the other withdrawal from cantonments outside the administrative frontier. That policy has been vigorously followed by Lord Curzon. He has placed a local Militia on the frontier, and has withdrawn the troops from cantonments outside the frontier and concentrated them in convenient cantonments where they will be in readiness to go at very short notice to the relief of the local levies if required. Suggestions have been made to the Indian Government to construct a railway down the Khaibar Pass, and to place a British garrison at Kotal, but these views did not recommend themselves to Lord Curzon and myself, and the only railroad made is one to Jamrud, in our own territory. I cannot leave the Indian Army without alluding to the irreparable loss India has sustained by the death of two distinguished soldiers—Sir Donald Stewart and Sir William Lockhart. Sir Donald Stewart's military reputation is well known. He was for fifteen years past a member of the Council of the Secretary of State, and a shrewder or more sagacious adviser never had a seat on that Council, and with his unfailing sagacity and great patience, he was as good an adviser in financial, political, and administrative questions as he was in military questions. Sir William Lockhart was a born leader of men, and a man of immense force of character. He no doubt shortened his life by his devotion to duty, for he was undergoing a course of German baths when he was

called upon to take up the command of the troops in the Tirah campaign. He went out at a moment's notice, and I fear that the hardships he underwent so impaired his health that he was never able fully to recover. There is one characteristic about these two great men. Both had rare powers of attracting the native officers and natives who served under them in such a way as to secure their complete confidence. There is another most distinguished Anglo-Indian soldier, Lord Roberts, who possesses this characteristic to a superlative degree. We have made enormous changes in India during the last ten years. Our Government is stronger and more solidified than it was before that period. The material prosperity of a large section of the population has greatly increased, and our mechanism of government has so improved and developed that I think it may fairly be claimed for it that it is the most advanced and scientific system that India has ever possessed. Yet sometimes I have doubts whether our popularity has increased. Sir, we have gone on improving our administration, we have passed up through various stages of administrative improvements, until administration at the present moment has reached the highest point of development. This work has been accomplished by a great deal of labour and ability, and I do not think too much credit can be given to those who have achieved it. We have codified the laws and simplified procedure, and we have made uniform our methods of administration, but, looking at all these great improvements, can it be said that they are as palatable to the people to whom they are applied as the older and cruder system? We have no fault to find with those who have administered the laws. They are fully up to the standard of those of earlier years in intelligence and sense of duty, but they do not get the opportunities which were afforded to the young men who formerly went out from here to serve in India early in life and usually spent their lives there, being placed, not infrequently, in isolated positions in which they had to depend on their own resources for the preservation of law and order. That has all gone. We have passed from the old patriarchal methods. The gentlemen who go out to India now are in a different position. Everybody has a code for everything, and if the code fails there is the telegraph by which he can get assistance at the earliest possible moment. But that is not the only evil from which civil servants in India suffer. They have everything that develops—telegraphs and railways—and the result is that they are so over-burdened with correspondence, Reports, and Returns, that they are really imprisoned in their offices for the greater part of the day, and it is only when such a great calamity as that with which India is now afflicted occurs and sweeps away all their stereotyped procedure that these men are able to come out of their offices and join with the other forces at work in dealing with the trouble. Then the sympathy of these men brooks no denial, and we see them come out and toil to ameliorate the condition of the sick and the poor. I hear from all sides in the distressed districts of India which are suffering such terrible loss that the work of these men has rekindled between the Government and the governed that feeling of regard and affection which was so marked a characteristic in India. We have a remarkable man as Viceroy, a man of untiring energy and unbounded power of work, and he has devoted his energy to every branch of administration. His wish is so to free the official that he shall be able to get more time to give to the essentials of administration, and therefore I am hopeful that, although one cannot but deplore the mass of suffering and misery through which India is passing, and which may occur again in subsequent years—I sincerely hope and believe that the outcome of this misfortune will not be without its benefits to India, that the wounds and scars which this terrible calamity has inflicted may be forgotten, and that interchange of kindly feeling and mutual regard among all classes who have fought the common fight may be a lasting and increasing influence in guiding the future fortunes of India.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Speaker do now leave the Chair."—(*Lord G. Hamilton.*)

*SIR HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.): I am sure the House is greatly indebted to the noble Lord for the admirable statement he has made. I have been struck by the pathos, eloquence, and luminous exposition of detail which has characterised his masterly speech

I think it will rank among the foremost statements of Indian finance that have been made to this House. The noble Lord has gone over the greater part of the ground over which it is usual to travel, and he has also dealt in a sympathetic manner with the great calamity from which India is suffering, and has brought before us the difficulties which he and his colleagues have had to face in this difficult situation. There are one or two points on which, perhaps, I do not quite agree with him and on which I may have to express my views in a few words, and beyond that I do not propose to trouble the House at any length. I should like, however, to add my testimony to the great loss India has sustained in the death of the great soldiers to which the noble Lord has referred. I was associated with Sir Donald Stewart when I was in office as Secretary of State, and I can state that not only was he one of the wisest of military advisers, but also one of the soundest financiers and most practical men in administration. We have sustained another loss this year, happily not occasioned by death. I deeply regret that one of the eminent civil servants to whom the administration of India has been entrusted has found himself compelled to deprive the Indian Government of his services—I refer to Mr. Dawkins, to whom the greater part of the credit for the reform of the Indian currency belongs. There were several figures given by the noble Lord which were interesting to the House, and one or two I should like to supplement. I quite admit that the Currency Commission did not anticipate the calamity that has fallen on the Empire of India during the last few months. I am sure that the members of that Commission would not have signed that Report and adopted so great a change if they had known that within a year we should be engaged in a war with South Africa, that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would have issued the largest loan since 1815, and that India would be suffering from a terrible famine. As far as we can see at present everything that has transpired since is encouraging as to the probable success of the currency policy. The noble Lord has told us how the unfavourable predictions have been falsified, but he has not told us the effect of this change upon trade. The House will remember the abnormal condition of trade as far as famine is concerned, and the state of things produced in the cotton trade as far as China in concerned. The total trade of India, in and out, was in 1898 105 millions; in 1899, 109 millions and a quarter; and in 1900, 115 millions and a quarter. So far as exports were concerned, in 1898 they were 56 millions; in 1899 65 millions; and in 1900 65 millions, notwithstanding that the export of wheat and rice was necessarily reduced by the diversion into the famine districts. I understand from the accounts that, on the 1st April, 1899, the currency of gold in reserve was two millions sterling, and on 7th March, 1900, seven millions sterling, and, in addition, the Secretary of State had accumulated in London a million and a half of gold. So the aggregate of gold under the control of the Secretary of State was eight millions and a half. Now, there must be in India a silver reserve. The noble Lord has had this year to buy silver. There is one factor it is impossible to pronounce accurately upon —the quantity of silver necessarily diverted into the famine districts, and that may disturb calculations. I understand the Indian Government intend to have a gold reserve of five millions. Beyond that, they propose to give gold in exchange for silver. The gold taken from currency in payment of notes is £130,700. I mention that as showing that the people are still pursuing the old habits of trade, and that the Report of the Committee that the great bulk of the internal transactions of India would continue to be carried on in silver is being borne out and the quantity of gold circulated is equally small. The gain is in the fixity of exchange between this country and India, and estimating the cost of a common denomination. I hope this great change which has marked the administration of the noble Lord will act most beneficially on the trade, commerce, taxation, and prosperity of India. As far as I can gather, a sum of money has evidently been exported from this country to India for investment in India. With reference to the famine I have nothing to add to the pathetic statement of the noble Lord, and his just expression of admiration of the manner in which the famine has been grappled with by the officials, and I hope the House will note what has been stated by the noble Lord and

the Viceroy of India, that the actual cost to the Government of India—not the people of India (that would have been a great deal more)—in the last two years has been thirteen millions sterling, an indication of the sound financial position in which India stands. The Secretary of State makes this a strong argument for objecting to India being relieved from Imperial funds. "India is able to meet its own requirements. We ought not to appeal to the Indian Exchequer to help us." I agree that an equilibrium should be maintained between income and expenditure, and I would oppose anything which would appear like the pauperisation of India. But the large excess of revenue out of which these large sums are being provided really means an excess of taxation levied beyond the actual requirements of the Indian Government in normal circumstances. In other words, if it had not been for this exceptional expenditure there must have been large reduction of taxation. That being so, I say we come to the point of voluntary contribution. There should be a payment made by Great Britain to her great dependency to help her in this great calamity. You may say India does not need it. But sympathy is a strong force in human affairs. Sentiment is a strong force in human affairs. We have recently received strong marks of sympathy from India and our colonies. There are two sides to this, and if we receive expressions of sympathy from India and the colonies we must be prepared in return to give expression of sympathy when the time arrives. A great Indian prince, the Maharaja of Gwalior, has recently offered to fit out a hospital ship for the use of the British Government in China. I suppose if that Indian prince had not come forward a hospital ship would not have been wanting, but throughout the length and breadth of the land this expression of sympathy from that great Indian prince to the mother country will be recognised and admired far more than its intrinsic value. If the Government had been prepared, not as a matter of dry finance, to say to India, "You are in financial difficulties, and we will relieve you," and the people of this country, through their representatives in Parliament, had said, "We will vote India a sum of money to aid her in her calamity as an expression of our national sympathy in addition to private charity," I believe that, as a matter of State policy, it would have been one of the wisest things the Imperial Government could have done. These perpetual appeals to the charitable section of the English public—I find no fault—are only responded to by a limited class, and the same class who give for the relief of the soldier, sailor, the suffering, and hospitals, whether in India or elsewhere. But there is a great mass of wealthy people in this country who give to nothing. It is only right and fair that they, deriving advantages from this great relationship between us and our colonies and India, should take their share, as part of the nation, in doing what I believe the nation would desire to have done. Whether the Secretary for India asks for a large or a small sum, and whether he terms it a loan without interest, or a grant, the handsomer, the more generous, and spontaneous it is, it will be better appreciated and approved by the people of this country, and will be accepted in the same spirit by the people of India. As to the proposals of Lord Welby's Commission, I think that the Report of that body has dispelled, and will dispel, a great many delusions which have taken hold of the popular mind in England and India with regard to our financial position there. That Commission was appointed with two objects. It was appointed to inquire into the administration and management of the military and civil expenditure of India, both at home and in India, and into the apportionment of the charge between the Imperial and the Indian Governments for purposes in which both Governments are interested. That Commission sat for two or three years and took the opportunity of ascertaining from the best authorities what were the facts of the case. I think the facts are stated in the Report with singular accuracy, clearness, and fairness, and for many years to come the various details of Indian finance will have there an authorised text-book. I have no fault to find with the facts which the Commission found as a jury. I am bound to say that I think the Commission have been very timid in their recommendations. There are some of their recommendations which I am glad to hear the noble Lord does not intend to accept. I am very sorry that they were not unanimous with refer-

ence to the audit. There was a very strong weight of opinion that though the present audit was very admirable, still it was desirable that the Comptroller and Auditor General in India should be put in the same position as the Comptroller and Auditor General in this country, and should be absolutely independent of the Executive. The only ground of objection I can trace was the very familiar one, "Oh, it would cost too much; it is not worth the expense." I think it is worth the expense. The last estimate I have seen of the cost of an independent audit in India puts the figure at £15,000 a year. I do not think that is a sum worth saving on a question of this magnitude. There is another point with reference to the position of the Finance Minister in the Indian Council. At present there are two military members in that body. I think the Commander-in-Chief ought to be removed, just as the Commander-in-Chief here is from the English Cabinet. That is a subject which I hope the Government will very carefully consider. The question of the debt of India is one upon which we have often had discussions in this House. Some gentleman sent me a book this week in which he stated that, while the English debt had been reduced by something like £140,000,000 since the Crimean War, the debt of India during that time had steadily increased. This is from a very respected author, and I am sure he would not make a misrepresentation. But he did not divide the debt into productive and non-productive debt. There is the ordinary debt which every State must incur, and there is the public works debt, which pays its own interest and repays its own capital. At the close of the Mutiny the ordinary debt of India stood at £97,000,000. In 1897 that had been reduced to £72,750,000. The noble Lord's Memorandum puts it in the clearest way, and it shows that now the entire debt of India, productive and non-pro-ductive, is £212,000,000. The assets which India has in the shape of railways, canals, irrigation works, money lent to corporations, and other valuable assets, is £182,000,000. The net debt of India at this moment, after having gone through this terrible famine, is £30,000,000. I do not believe there is any great civilised Government in the world where there is proportionally so small a debt as there is in India at the present time. This Commission has also found that the civil expenditure is not excessive as compared with 1875, and that it has not been excessive as compared with the expenditure of other countries, and that although there has been a net increase of 25 per cent., yet there has been an increase in the population of 20 per cent. I hope the Government will take into its most careful consideration the various recommendations of the Commission, and even if they do not agree with them they should settle some of the questions once and for all. I do not think the Treasury has done what it ought to have done in the proposal now suggested as the financial settlement. I do not think £250,000 a year does adequately meet the claims of India. I think there is a greater claim, not upon the charity, but upon the justice of the people of this country, with reference to military charges. It has been proved, and the noble Lord's speech shows it, that a great portion of your military reserve is in India. You had to have recourse to India with reference both to South Africa and to China. I have no wish that India should in any way profit by the transaction, but, looking at it as a whole judicially and fairly, I think that the contribution from India to what is called the capitation grant is too high. I express again my thanks to the noble Lord, and I re-echo his hope in regard to the somewhat gloomy view of the Viceroy on Tuesday, which is certainly modified by the telegram on Wednesday from Lord Northcote, and of course Bombay is a most important district. We are at present in July, and I think August is an important month in the history of the monsoon, and I hope the situation may not prove to be so gloomy as it is at present anticipated; but whether that be so or not, I think we shall not forget, India will not forget, and history will not forget the admirable manner in which the British Government in India and the officials of the British Government have grappled with this calamity with a success which has no parallel in the history of India.

MR. SOUTTAR (Dumfriesshire): The speeches to which I have had the pleasure of listening have encouraged me the more earnestly to say that which I have to say. The speech of my right hon. friend was, of course, a direct encouragement, and the speech of the noble Lord who repre-

sents India in this House was also an encouragement of no mean order, for he told us three things. In the first place, he warned us that the danger was by no means at an end; in the second place, by the figures he laid before the House, he distinctly showed that, although the Government of India had been exceedingly generous as far as its power went, it had been unable to do more than meet a small proportion of the great loss which the country had experienced; and in the third place, if I may say so, he showed that his heart is not entirely closed and sealed against the proposition which I have to make. In making that proposition, I ought to explain that I have been advised that it is not in order for any private Member to propose that a definite sum should be granted from the Exchequer, and perhaps, instead of saying anything about a definite sum, if I substitute the words "a large and generous grant," and ask hon. Members to bear in mind that £5,000,000 is the amount I have in my mind, that will sufficiently meet the case. But before I proceed to say anything about that, I should like to be permitted, partly from my own personal knowledge of India, and partly from what I heard lately, to say how immensely everyone, so far as I know, on this side of the House appreciates the efforts made by the Government of India in connection with this famine. From the Viceroy down to the humblest official, both natives and Europeans, they have done their very utmost, as far as in them lay and as far as they had the power, to mitigate the great calamity which has befallen India. Of that there is not the slightest doubt, and concerning that there is no difference of opinion. One thing sometimes strikes me as rather strange, and I daresay other Members have thought the same, and that is, that in a country where so many men are working with extraordinary earnestness on behalf of the people, there should yet be such continued suffering. In the old days you could account for these things by saying that they were the product of war and misrule, but there has been no war within the frontiers of India for forty years, and during that time there have been ten famines, and 15,000,000 people have died of famine and of the diseases connected with famine. This famine is the worst of all. The noble Lord has given us extraordinary figures showing that this is a famine of no ordinary degree. It is perfectly impossible to really appreciate the meaning of these figures. The more one studies them the more one feels that perhaps in the history of the world there has never been a famine like the one we are considering to-night. Moreover, this famine is the greater because it has so soon followed the famine of 1897. Many of the natives of India, I think, were only able to gather one meagre crop after that famine had passed before this second famine was upon them. I mention that, not for the sake of letting Members see what a big famine it is, but because I wish to impress upon their minds this circumstance, that this is an extraordinary famine, that therefore the occasion is an extraordinary occasion, and that the grant made in connection with this famine need not for a single moment be regarded as a precedent in connection with any future famine. The question is, Is there such an emergency as to need a considerable grant? I think there is; and for two very clear reasons. In the first place, I think the people have got to the end of their resources. Their ornaments are gone, their clothing is gone, their furniture is gone, and the very fittings of their houses have been sold in order to keep bare life within their bodies. Not only that, but this famine, which has been a famine of food and fodder and water, has swept away almost entirely the plough cattle of the people, and there they stand facing the future in perfect misery and hopeless despair. That is a very serious consideration. Here we have millions of people practically bankrupt, their cattle gone, their credit gone, having no hope in the present, and very little hope with regard to the future. But I think we may go further and say that we can prove emergency from the circumstance that the Government have got to the end of their resources. The noble Lord, in speaking of the resources of the Government, said he had yet borrowing powers to the extent of £9,000,000. I suppose, as a matter of fact, having the whole credit of the British name behind him, he has borrowing powers for £90,000,000 if he is so disposed, but surely borrowing is not the way to meet a great difficulty like this. Surely the noble Lord will not contend that the people of India should in that way be plunged yet more heavily into debt Moreover, it becomes more serious when

you consider, as my right hon. friend has pointed out with great clearness, that the Government of India is the people of India. In this country you might possibly establish a tax by which you could raise a certain amount of money, the incidence of the tax falling at first on the wealthy people of the land—such a tax as the income tax. You could not do that in India, because the revenue is received from salt and land, and everyone who knows India knows that to pay more money as interest on loans, or anything else, is only to burden more seriously the miserably poor in order to help those who are yet more miserable. If we desire to see the exact condition of India we have only to look at the words in one of the paragraphs of the Viceroy's appeal. He says—

"If the question be asked, Why is Government not able to assume the entire burden, and to dispense with all external aid? no false pride need deter me from giving a frank reply. Government is straining every nerve, is pouring out its money, is shrinking from no obligation, however severe. . . . But over and above this expenditure, which cripples our development in a score of ways, there lies a vast area of need which, do what we may, we can barely reach, and in which extraneous contributions supply an invaluable reinforcement. . . . This is a field of enormous and almost undiscoverable extent, the margin of which the already overworked official hardly touches, but which is, in a peculiar and inevitable degree, the property of individual effort and private generosity."

No words I can utter are likely to carry more conviction than those of the Viceroy. He tells us that the Government are straining every nerve, and that yet there is an enormous field of almost undiscoverable extent, the very margin of which is scarcely touched. The Viceroy's appeal has produced an altogether inadequate result, and that field will remain untouched until the British Parliament rises to a sense of its duty, and steps forward to do its part. Seeing the need of India, let me give one or two simple reasons why I think we should help her in her hour of need. The first is a somewhat selfish but a very forcible reason. India is the fourth best customer we have in the whole world as a commercial nation. The United States comes first, then France, then Germany, and then India. In a very little while India will be our second best customer. She is already a better customer to us than the whole of Australasia, and in a little while, if the present rate of progress continues, she will be a better customer than the whole of our colonies put together. In ordinary business life, if a business man in a large way has a customer a little embarrassed for the moment, he does not crush that customer; he does his very utmost to help him. He remembers what he has made out of that customer in the past; he thinks of what he hopes to make in the future, and he does his best to help the lame dog over the stile. We have made a great deal out of India in the past; we hope to make a great deal out of her in the future; and we ought therefore to come forward and help her in this hour of trial. But there is a higher reason than that why we should help India. Notice has already been taken of what India has done for us in connection with foreign affairs. In our embarrassments in South Africa, in China, and on the West Coast of Africa, who has come forward to help us loyally, if not India? Indian troops were, I believe, the first to face the enemy in South Africa; they will be the first in any number to face the enemy in China. India has lent 22,000 troops to her Suzerain, and she may lend a great many more. Have hon. Members ever reflected what would have been the case to-day if India had been disloyal? Have they ever reflected what might be the case if some day India should be disloyal? You cannot make a country loyal in a day; but you can gradually make a country loyal by good government, by a display of good feeling, and by acts of kindly generosity. I have lived for years in India, and I do not hesitate to say as my deliberate conviction that the Indians are the most grateful people on the face of the earth. If we would only rise to the occasion and make this grant—which we should never miss—I believe we should make India loyal for half a century to come. Fathers would tell their sons of the time when famine and pestilence walked hand in hand throughout the land, when the seed corn had passed away, when the plough cattle had died, and when apparently nothing remained for the people but to die; and then at that time England came forward with a great gift for new seed corn and for new plough cattle, and saved the lives of the people, and brought back happiness and contentment to the homesteads. There is one other reason I should like to give, and that is that India has cost us nothing in the past. We have heard the

noble Lord speaking about the necessity of teaching India good finance, showing India a good example, and teaching her economy, and so on. There was not a word in regard to that with which we would not all agree, and yet at the same time the thought came that he was speaking as if India needed to learn that lesson. Nothing of the sort. India has cost this country practically nothing. Our colonies have cost us hundreds of millions of pounds; India has never cost us a penny. The British Empire in India was founded, and has been extended and consolidated, by Indian resources, and the British taxpayer has never been asked to contribute a single shilling. But beyond that, India costs us nothing at the present. Just consider the contrast for a moment between the Colonial Office and the India Office. We know how difficult it is to get up a debate in this House on any Indian subject. Why is that so? Because the expenses of the India Office, from the salary of the noble Lord down to the wages of the meanest employee in the office, are borne by the Indian peasant, and do not come before this House. We have no such difficulty with regard to the Colonial Office, because the salary of the Colonial Secretary, and the great expenses of that Department, are borne absolutely by the British taxpayer. If you look at the thing more broadly, it becomes even more striking still. The noble Lord at the head of the Government made a very remarkable speech a few days ago in which were words of very solid wisdom. He spoke of the burdens of empire, and showed that those burdens might have to be more evenly divided than at present.* I entirely agree, if I may be permitted to say so, with the doctrine he preached; but when that day comes India will have nothing to fear, as she already pays her full share. Every penny that can possibly be put upon India is put upon her to-day. The colonies subscribe in all one and a half millions towards Imperial defence, whereas India subscribes from twenty-two to twenty-five millions. Above and beyond that, India has been burdened with the expense of many wars; she has had to bear the expense of wars, either wholly or in part, to which the colonies have not contributed a single shilling. Our richest colonies have been spared, but the poorest and most miserable peasantry in the world have been taxed not only for their own welfare but also to preserve the name and reputation of our great Empire in portions of two continents. The noble Lord indicated that it is quite possible that the colonies have been treated with generosity while India has been treated with strict justice. Surely that is an argument in favour of helping India to-day. If India has stood shoulder to shoulder with us in our times of trial, if she has borne the heat and burden of the day, surely it is right that we should stand shoulder to shoulder with India now that her great day of trial has come. I might contend that strict justice demands that we should help India. My right hon. friend went into that point, and I will not carry it any further. There are men in this House who understand these things a great deal better than I do, but my superficial judgment on the Report of the Royal Commission is that this is an act not of mere generosity but of absolute justice and equity. I believe the British Empire owes a debt to the Indian peasant of which these millions would be but a payment on account. Finally, it seems to me that our national dignity is indissolubly bound up in giving help to India at this time. We have made ourselves responsible in a very striking degree for the government of India. We hold in India 300,000,000 of our fellow-creatures in the hollow of our hand; we govern them just as we like, without even asking the opinion of the natives of India. Of course, we are not responsible for this famine; it is the act of God; but surely the position we have taken up in regard to India makes it absolutely necessary that we should, by every means in our power, mitigate the calamity which has come upon the people. We have vaunted the Government of India; we have said to the nations of the world, "Come and see how Englishmen can govern Orientals," and it seems to me that the miseries of our fellow-subjects in India to-day touch our honour, and are a blot upon the fair fame of our Empire. The appeal of the Viceroy has gone throughout the length and breadth of the world; the whole world is therefore looking at us and wondering how we will act, and the strange thing is that this House has not yet granted even a £5 note towards the

* See speech of Marquess of Salisbury, 20th July, 1900, page 616 of this volume.

Famine Relief Fund. If the noble Lord is obdurate, and this proposal is cast aside, it may be that we shall have to record that the greatest famine of the nineteenth century was allowed to eat its way through the country without any help being given to the people from the legislative assembly of the greatest and richest Empire the world has ever seen. Surely such a conclusion would be to our everlasting shame. I cannot believe that the Government mean to put such an affront upon the nation. Rather do I believe that they will fall in with what I know to be the desire of the House and of the country at large, and make a generous gift to the Indian people out of the fulness of our abounding wealth, to strengthen the hands of an admirable Viceroy, and to gladden the hearts of a greatly suffering people. I beg to move the Amendment standing in my name.

SIR WILLIAM WEDDERBURN (Banffshire): I beg to second the motion, and I trust that the House will favourably consider this appeal to its pity. When the proposal for a Parliamentary free grant was discussed last April,* it was received with favour by hon. Members on both sides of the House, but the Government did not then see its way to take any action. The First Lord of the Treasury recognised the terrible distress of India, and was prepared, if needful, to apply without hesitation to Parliament for assistance, but he did not accede to our request, as the Government of India did not then anticipate difficulty in providing relief. It will be seen that this refusal was conditional; and I submit that since April things in India have become much worse, and that the time has come to reconsider the original decision. I hope also that when I make clear the purpose for which we ask the grant the objection taken by the First Lord may in some measure be removed. He pointed out that the Indian revenues sufficed to provide the relief undertaken by the Indian Government. We quite understand that; and we do not propose that the Parliamentary grant should go as an addition to the Indian revenues. On the contrary, we wish the Parliamentary grant to go to the famine-stricken people by way of charity in ways altogether outside the scope of ordinary Government relief. Our object will become clear if the House will consider the Famine Code rules, which distinguish by a broad line between the relief functions of the Indian Government, on the one hand, and the functions of charity on the other. These rules were summarised in a Memorandum sent last April by the Secretary of State to the Lord Mayor, at the time the Mansion House Fund was opened. In this Memorandum the noble Lord stated first the duties undertaken by Government. He said that "the Government undertakes to prevent death, and to relieve misery from famine in British India, at the cost of the Indian Treasury, so far as organisation and effort can accomplish these ends." And he then proceeded to specify the four purposes for which charity was required. These were (1) extra comforts in the shape of food and clothing, (2) the maintenance of orphans, (3) the relief of specially helpless classes, and (4) the provision of cattle, seed-corn, and implements to enable the cultivators to make a fresh start. This division of labour was in accordance with the recommendations of the Famine Commissioners, the functions of the Government being limited to the preservation of life and health; while charity was expected to supplement this work in certain exceptional cases, devoting itself principally to the duty of giving the cultivators a fresh start in life. Now in 1897 the charitable contributions were very large, so that no less a sum than three quarters of a million sterling could be allotted out of the Charity Fund for cattle, seed grain, and implements. It thus resulted that in 1897 the duties undertaken by Government, and the duties undertaken by charity, were both sufficiently fulfilled. But this unhappily is not the case in 1900. As regards the duties undertaken by Government, we know, from the assurance of the First Lord, that the Indian Government have the necessary funds, and no help is required. But as regards the relief dependent upon charity the resources are altogether insufficient, and it is here that special and exceptional help is required most urgently. I would specially invite the attention of the House to the almost despairing appeal made by Lord Curzon to the world's charity on the 28th of May. In that appeal he pointed

* See discussion on Resolution proposed by Sir W. Wedderburn, 3rd April, 1900, *The Parliamentary Debates* [Fourth Series], Vol. lxxxi., page 1080.

out how vastly greater the present famine is than that of 1897, both in extent and intensity, while up to date only about half the amount previously subscribed had come in. This cry for help has been answered from many quarters of the globe—from our own colonies, some of whom have voted Parliamentary grants, from the United States, from the Emperor of Germany, even from the mandarins of China, and the Sultan of Turkey. Under these circumstances it does not seem fitting that this Parliament, which represents the richest community in the world, should stand aloof and refuse a contribution proportioned to the wealth of this country and its responsibility for the welfare of the Indian people. As far as I can judge, there is in the country no unwillingness to make this free grant. On the contrary, expressions of public opinion seem all to be in its favour; and I brought specially to the notice of the noble Lord the memorial in support of a free grant from so important a public body as the Glasgow Chamber of Commerce. As regards the purposes of this free gift, I would repeat that we do not desire it to be used in support of the general finances of India. It should be placed at the disposal of the Viceroy, to be utilised, according to the local needs of the suffering provinces, in helping the prostrate cultivators to their feet, and giving them a chance of regaining their normal condition. The excessive need in the present case has arisen from the wholesale destruction of plough and milch cattle by the drought, the loss amounting to 80 and 90 per cent. in some districts. Without plough cattle the cultivators cannot take advantage of the rains now falling; and so pressing is the need that the Government of India is making advances to the cultivators for this purpose exceeding a million sterling. But this relief will only be partial and temporary, for those loans are only made to those who can give security, and, as they must be repaid, the object of giving the cultivators a fresh start will not be accomplished. What is wanted is a free gift of cattle, seed, and implements, to all who desire to return to their village homes and regain their old position of skilful and industrious peasants. The noble Lord has told the House how devotedly the officials in India have worked, high and low. I desire respectfully to associate myself in appreciating the noble work that has been done, and would specially mention that from all parts of India communications reach me expressing deep gratitude to his Excellency the Viceroy for his personal exertions. And I would ask whether this House would not be fitly recognising these exertions by placing at Lord Curzon's disposal funds which will enable him to deal promptly and effectually with the misery by which he is surrounded. I see it announced that he is about to visit Gujerat, which is probably the most sorely afflicted province in India; and if the House will bear with me I will read a short extract describing the condition of the people there, as seen by Mr. Vaughan Nash, the special correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian*—

> "When I look back on the scenes through which I have passed and think of the sum total of human misery, and the despair I have seen on people's faces, and the ruin this famine has brought on their homes and fields and on their families, I feel it is hopeless to attempt to put into words the agony of India. You see these simple childlike races, devoted to their homes and their children, made outcasts by the famine and forced to abandon their customs and leave their homes to get a little bread by labour at stone-breaking or earth-carrying. Most poignant of all in the appeal it made to me was the silence and submission with which they bear their trials. In the hospital sheds, where you pick your way between the rows of dying, or out in the burning sun, where mothers are hammering stones with one hand and hugging a child with the other, you rarely hear a complaint. Even the gift of tears seems to have dried up, except among the children, whom you see crying sometimes by the side of a sick mother. Those who know India may be able to tell you what spirit it is that looks out from the eyes of these miserables, broken and quenched as they are, and which keeps them dignified and composed in surroundings that are degrading and horrifying. It seemed to me to be the spirit of a noble people, who had won refinement and discipline when our own forefathers were savages, a people we may well be glad to succour and proud to rule, looking out at the wreck of all things, seeing their gods, their homes, their country shrivelling to dust and ashes."

No words of mine will add to the pathos of this description. But in asking hon. Members to take a merciful view of the present appeal I would remind them that the famine in India is essentially a famine of money, not of food, and that, on an average three-halfpence a day is sufficient to keep these poor people from the pangs of death by hunger. I beg to second the motion of my hon. friend.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out from the word 'That,' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words 'looking to the special needs of the famine-stricken people in India at the present time, this House recognises that funds are urgently required to feed, clothe, and house the cultivators in their villages until their crops are ripe; to provide them with plough cattle, seed, and other requisites of cultivation; and to restore them to their normal economic condition; that these requirements cannot be adequately met from Indian revenues raised from the suffering Indian people, and within the necessarily restricted field of ordinary relief operations; that the funds subscribed by charity are altogether insufficient for these purposes; and this House is therefore of opinion that a large and generous free grant should be provided to assist in meeting this unprecedented calamity,' instead thereof."—(*Mr. Souttar.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): I do not think it would be respectful to the House that I, who am very little cognisant of the affairs of India, should attempt to detain it with arguments on the general subject on an evening when the debate must range over so vast a field; but the Amendment which has been moved induces me to detain the House for a short time while I express the views of the Government on this subject. It is a subject which commends itself to all our sympathies. All of us must have deeply felt the sufferings in India from this terrible famine; all of us have desired on the ground of that sentiment to which the right hon. Member for East Wolverhampton referred to assist India if she needs assistance, even at considerable cost to ourselves. I hope, therefore, that in what I have to say to the House, I shall not be considered as in any way approaching this subject merely from the point of view of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. But I am bound to say something as Chancellor of the Exchequer, for I am afraid that what my noble friend the Secretary of State for India said in the earlier part of the evening is but too true—that nowadays every one sympathises with expenditure, and few people indeed care how that expenditure is to be provided. What are we asked to do by the Amendment of the hon. member? It would not have been, I believe, in accordance with our rules that it should have specified any sum as a grant to India in the painful circumstances in which the Amendment is submitted, but on the Paper we find that the hon. Member desires to grant a sum of £5,000,000 to India in aid of this famine. Now the speech of the hon. Member who made this proposal differed in one very material respect from the speech of the hon. Member who seconded. The hon. Member who made this proposal dwelt at some length on the sufferings of the population of India from taxation; and that view was also taken by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton, who, I think, suggested to the House that if it had not been for the famine large remissions of taxation would have been made in India; and therefore he argued—though I do not quite see that the argument was justified—that India was more highly taxed than this country. If there is to be a question of a grant to India from the Imperial Exchequer, I hope hon. Members will recollect when they talk so readily about the Imperial Exchequer that the Exchequer is the Exchequer of the United Kingdom and not of the Empire at large; and if it be a question of the power of India to bear taxation for this purpose, and the power of the United Kingdom at the present time to make this grant, there are some facts which I should like to place before the consideration of hon. Members. We have heard from my noble friend that the surplus of India in the year just closed is £2,800,000. I believe that in the previous year it was £2,600,000; but I have to remind the House that our deficit in the year just closed was nearly £14,000,000, that our estimated deficit in the present year is something like £23,000,000, and that within the last few days additional Estimates to the extent of £13,000,000 have been laid on the Table of the House. It is perfectly clear, therefore, that for our own objects we are not only not paying our way at the present time, but that we are largely increasing the debt of the country. What does the proposal of the hon. Member amount to, and how is this £5,000,000 to be provided? Is it to be provided by increased taxation in this country? Increased taxation for this object would be no more possible than it was for the whole of the great expenditure of the war. What we are asked to do, therefore, when we have in the present

year and last year added to our debt £37,000,000, and when we may have to add more, is to increase our debt still further for the purpose of granting £5,000,000 to India, the whole net debt of which is no more than £30,000,000. But is it for the relief of our Indian fellow subjects? I speak subject to correction, but I believe that the main suffering from this famine is in the native States, for the finances of which and for the subjects of which we are in no degree responsible; and therefore it is proposed that either by way of increased debt or increased taxation—probably by way of increased debt—the taxpayers of this country should at such a time as this provide £5,000,000 mostly for the benefit of the inhabitants of the native States, over whose finances we have no power at all. That is a proposition which appears to me to demand the most careful consideration of anyone who has the least regard for the finances of this country. I notice that the hon. Baronet who seconded the Amendment did not put it on the ground of the taxation of India at all. He says, "I do not want to relieve the finances of India or the taxation of India." He agrees that the Indian Government has sufficient means and power to raise money to meet all the exigencies; the hon. Baronet put it purely on the ground of charity. His suggestion was that it was a grant we should never miss, and I think the hon. Member who made the proposal said it would be a generous gift out of our fulness and abounding wealth to the poverty-stricken population of India. I have shown the House the condition of the Exchequers of the two countries at the present time, and I confess astonishment that such a proposition should be based on such grounds as these, because it is not as if those who are responsible for the finances of India came to the Government of this country, or came to the House of Commons, and said, "We are in a position in which we are unable to provide sufficient means to meet what is required of us; we feel that we require the help of the United Kingdom in this great Indian difficulty; we appeal to you for that help which we think you ought to give us in remembrance of the past and what we have done for you." That would be a request which I should be the last man to disregard; it would be a request which I should feel bound to consider to the utmost of my power, whatever the condition of our finances here; but it is not the proposition we are considering to-night. We have been told by my noble friend, speaking after communication with the Government of India and with the authority of the Council of India, that this grant is not required; and, more, not only that it is not required, but that nothing could be done in the circumstances as they now exist which would be more prejudicial to the future of India than such a grant as is suggested. I think someone said that it would make no precedent, because this is the most serious famine that has ever been. But it would be a most dangerous precedent. Cannot the hon. Member see that if there be one duty more than another incumbent on the Government of India it is to provide beforehand for serious famines of this kind? Cannot he see that if we were to once give such a grant as is proposed without a request from the Secretary for India in Council, little provision for famine would be made in future? The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Wolverhampton felt the force of that argument used by my noble friend, and I for one would never be responsible for detracting so completely from the responsibility of the India Office, for the thing which above all others they ought to care for, the preparations they should make by the machinery of their administrative government for famine by imposing upon ourselves a burden that they do not ask us to bear, and for which they have a special fund.

SIR HENRY FOWLER: You did it in the Afghan War.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: Why? Because it was the opinion of the Parliament of that day that the Afghan War had been undertaken at the instance of the Home Government and against the necessities or requirements of India, and, therefore, in fairness the people of the United Kingdom should pay for it. But this is an entirely different thing from making a grant towards the Indian famine against the wish of the Secretary for India. Is it suggested for a moment that we are not doing anything at the present time to assist the Indian Government in matters of finance? The hon. Member who made this proposal stated that among the advan-

tages which India had given to the United Kingdom was that she had lent 32,000 troops for South Africa and China. That no doubt is the case, but we are paying for them. We are relieving India of the whole cost of those troops while they are employed in South Africa and China. Why is it that the people of India maintain an army like every other State? It is required not merely for quiet times but for times of emergency; and this being a quiet time in India she is able, at our request, to spare some Indian troops for service both in South Africa and in China. We are paying the whole of the cost of those troops, though from my point of view it appears that India has some interest in Chinese affairs as well as the United Kingdom. By paying the whole of the cost of these troops we shall relieve India in this present financial year, I suppose, probably of not less than £3,000,000. I do hope that the House will have some regard in this matter not only to the claims of sentiment and sympathy, but also to the claims of reason and sound finance in India and in this country. The hon. Member deprecated India being called upon to meet this famine by borrowing. Why should we who are not responsible for this famine be called upon to meet it by borrowing? If the Indian Government comes to us and says that their resources are exhausted, that the future before them is so dark that they do not see their way to meet this terrible calamity without assistance from us, that assistance will be cordially given; but till that request is made I hope the House will support the Government in declining to assent to a proposal which, recommended as it may be by claims of sentiment and sympathy, is, in my opinion, contrary to the future advantage not merely of the United Kingdom, but of India itself.

*MR. MACLEAN: The House has now had the privilege of hearing from the Chancellor of the Exchequer the real reason which has induced Her Majesty's Government to refuse to give a grant to India. Such a grant has been approved of by the public feeling in this country, but it has never been listened to by Her Majesty's Government. Now we know from the responsible administrator of the finances of this Empire what is the real reason that has induced the Government to take up this position in regard to this matter. The Chancellor of the Exchequer says that this is a time of great pressure upon the finances of the United Kingdom, and he also says that it is a time of great prosperity for the finances of India. But is there any real comparison between the two countries? Are not the resources of every taxpayer in England one hundredfold greater than those of the Indian peasant? Do we not know the extreme pressure of the taxation on the poor people of India? In this country taxation is scarcely felt by any body, and it is a very light pressure upon the country. The taxes here are mainly paid by the wealthy, and they are hardly felt by the poorest in our midst. But every poor man in India pays his share of taxation, and feels the pressure of it very acutely indeed. I was surprised to hear the Chancellor of the Exchequer say that no appeal had ever been made from India for help, and that if such an appeal were made it would have at once been listened to.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: Not by the Government.

*MR. MACLEAN: Why has Lord Curzon had to scour the world in the hope of getting charity from all the nations of the earth instead of coming to Her Majesty's Government at home, from whom he might have got fifty times as much as all the foreign countries were subscribing in charity for the benefit of India? Is it not that he has had a hint from the Government that it is not desirable, and that it is not considered appropriate that they should be pressed to give a large grant to India at the present moment. The Chancellor of the Exchequer says that no need has arisen. I say it has arisen. It has been asserted in many of the speeches which have been made that everything has been done in India to avert famine that was possible, but that is not the case. Within the last forty years there have been ten recurring famines in India which have swept away at a moderate computation 15,000,000 human beings. These people have been absolutely wiped out of existence. The present famine is incomparably a greater famine than any of the nine famines which have preceded it. We cannot tell at the present moment what the extent

of that famine has been, but I should say it would be no exaggeration to declare that between 2,000,000 and 3,000,000 human beings have died through the ravages of this famine in India. Therefore, when it is said by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton that the administration of famine relief in India during the past year has been marked by wonderful success, I deny that that has been the case. The first plain duty of the Government has been frankly acknowledged to be to prevent death, and I say with perfect fearlessness in this House that the Government have not prevented death, and that people have died every week by tens of thousands without getting any help from the Government at all. Look at the returns published from Bombay of the deaths which have occurred in that Presidency, and in the native States. There are 1,500,000 people on famine relief in the Bombay Presidency, and the deaths among those people alone amount to 13,000 per week—that is to say, between 650,000 and 700,000 deaths in one year. Therefore in two years, if this famine lasts, the whole of that population of 1,250,000 human beings will have been completely swept away by the ravages of famine. It has been stated in many quarters that it is not famine that has caused the death of all these people but cholera, or intermittent fever. But those are merely different names for the same thing, and they are merely aliases for what is the real cause of the death of the people which is simply starvation. The people come to these relief camps which are nothing but pest houses where they are exposed to the ravages of epidemics. They come to these relief camps from their homes in the last stage of exhaustion, for they have not the means of subsistence or the means of recovering strength to do the work which they are called upon to do. Consequently they fall victims to these epidemic diseases and they die off rapidly. That is the cause of the appalling mortality which has occurred in India. Upon whom does the responsibility for this mortality rest? It is a mortality which is admitted on all hands, and even the noble Lord the Secretary of State for India would not venture to deny it. Upon whom does the responsibility rest? It is divided between the Secretary of State and the Viceroy of India. I do not mean the Secretary of State personally. I have no doubt of his sympathy with the people of India, and I agree with a great deal he has said about the admirable way in which a great part of the work has been done. I am aware that large sums of money have been spent, but the staff out there has not been sufficient to give the people relief. Directly cholera appeared, those great camps that are formed should have been broken up and the people distributed in their own districts, and looked after more carefully by officers of the Government. The Governor of Bombay acknowledges that his staff was so small that the areas affected could not be covered. There is room for the employment of Imperial funds and Imperial officers to help those civil and military servants of the Crown in India who have been so splendidly doing their work as Englishmen under most difficult circumstances. But nothing of the sort has been done by the Government of India. On the contrary, they have sat still and done nothing. The noble Lord has waited in his office for the monsoon to appear. He has of course written the inevitable letter to the Lord Mayor, which seems to be a remedy for all the ills which flesh is heir to. Instead of presenting money to that country, he is now going to accept a large gift of money from the Maharaja of Gwalior, who is a rich Indian prince. The noble Lord came down here the other day with an admirable ingenuousness which we cannot too much applaud, and spoke of the great gift which the Maharaja of Gwalior has made in order to fit up a hospital for the benefit of our soldiers and sailors engaged in the Chinese War. I should say that when the Imperial Government received an offer of that sort—which seems to me to be only another illustration of that spurious Imperialism which is spreading like a parasite over the whole British Empire—at a time when India is suffering the terrible ravages of famine; when they received an offer of nearly £200,000 from an Indian prince, they would have had the politeness to refuse such an offer and tell that native prince that he could better employ his money by giving it to his own starving fellow countrymen at home. We have had enough of these offers of gifts of hospitals from all parts of the world. England ought to be ashamed to accept

such gifts from any country so long as we are rich and strong enough to maintain our own soldiers and sailors in health or in sickness; and we do not want to have hospitals sent to us as free gifts, either by enterprising citizens in America or India who desire social recognition in English society, or from Indian princes who wish to compete with one another for the favour of the Imperial Government. So much with regard to the responsibility of the Home Government. But the responsibility of the Government of India lies much deeper. The noble Lord the Viceroy of India is a man of great personal energy and ability, and he has taken a step which I ventured two months ago to recommend him to take in this House. I stated here that it would be very much better if instead of issuing admirable regulations he came down from the heights of Simla and went about in the poor districts to see for himself what could be done to deal with this great difficulty.

*Lord G. HAMILTON: He visited all the districts last year.

*Mr. MACLEAN: Yes, that was a long time ago. But I am very glad to see that he is now trying to put all the new energy he can into the people who are charged with the duty of conducting the administration in India. There is this to be said with regard to the resolution proposed by my hon. friend opposite: that it will have to come eventually to a free gift to the people of India from the Imperial Treasury. There is no doubt that India is bleeding to death under our rule, and that the country is nearly exhausted. India has mainly an agricultural population, but the people have not the means by which they can produce crops and restore the land to a state of fertility unless a free gift is made to them. A free gift given in the way of charity will not suffice, for the money will be spent upon necessaries and the land will be no better off. Such gifts ought to be supplemented with a comprehensive policy, and one distinguished by foresight. That policy was framed long ago by the Government of India on the recommendation of a gentleman who was one of the most distinguished public servants who ever existed in India. Forty years ago when there was a great famine in the North-West Provinces Lord Canning, who was Viceroy of India, appointed the late Colonel Baird Smith, who was equally distinguished by his valour and his administrative capacity, to draw up a report upon the famine and advise the Government of India as to what could be done to prevent the recurrence of such a stupendous calamity. Colonel Baird Smith injured his own health in pursuing that work, but he furnished a most comprehensive and able State paper in which he recommended that the land assessment of India should be permanently settled for the whole of that country, and not merely in a few provinces of Bengal. That was a distinct recommendation that he made, and he converted to his view not only Lord Canning, but also Lord Lawrence and Sir Richard Temple. Not only did he convert people out in India, but that policy of settling the land revenue on a fair basis and fixing it for all time was taken up in this country by the late Sir Charles Wood and Sir Stafford Northcote, and it only failed because the Manchester school at that time foresaw that if the land revenue was reduced very heavy indirect taxation would be the result and large import duties would be levied on English piece goods. That is the real remedy for the state of things which exists in India, and it is the only manner in which the ryot will be enabled to accumulate stock and to devote all his energy to the cultivation of the soil. At the present time the Indian peasant is virtually taxed upon his own improvements. He is rack-rented on his own improvements. Directly he gets his head above water and succeeds in cultivating a certain portion of land, and getting more out of it, the agent of the State comes down on him and demands half the net profit of his field, and drives him back again to the stage of despair from which he had just emerged. Depend upon it, if we are ever to appreciate our real responsibility to the people of India we must undertake a reform of this land assessment, and we must fix it on a reasonable scale. When I mentioned this subject in the House a couple of months ago, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton rebuked me for saying that the land revenues of India brought in £18,000,000 a year, and were in spite of the famine expected to bring in that amount next year. The right hon.

Gentleman quoted Mr. Fawcett to show that these land revenues were merely a portion of the rent. Those of us who have had any connection with India, and who have studied the working of the land assessment and the terrible results which follow from it, know the position much better than Mr. Fawcett, and we are not going to be overawed by schoolmen from Oxford or Cambridge. Only to-day I came upon an extract from a book which was sent me which shows the view taken of this matter by no less a person than Sir Louis Mallet, who is one of the most fervent disciples of Cobden, John Stuart Mill, and the Manchester school. He had also some acquaintance with India, and he said that the results of this land assessment were underrated, and that he would rejoice to see it placed on a more satisfactory footing. That would be a policy worthy of an Empire like this to undertake. We are accustomed to speak of the benefits which railways and irrigation works have conferred in India. I do not undervalue these great improvements, but I say the natural fertility of the land in spite of them is decreasing in India. I will quote one or two figures showing that. In the middle of the seventeenth century, during the height of the prosperity of the Mogul Empire, the average produce of rice in India was 1,335 lb. per acre, of wheat 1,155 lb., and of cotton 67 lb. The statistics for the nineteenth century show that the average yield of rice per acre is from 800 lb. to 900 lb., of wheat 600 lb., and of cotton 52 lb., so that the actual produce of the land, in spite of all that has been done, has fallen something like 50 per cent. The question which suggests itself is, what remedial measures must be adopted to improve the fertility of the soil? I venture to point out one such measure based on the most careful study of India, and recommended by some of the most able statesmen who have ever ruled that country, and that is to revise the system of land assessment and to give fair play to the Indian agriculturist. I am quite sure that if Lord Curzon would examine this matter for himself he would build up for himself an enduring fame and would redeem this country from the reproach that while India has a most fertile soil and a most docile population she has a very incompetent Government.

*MR. JOSEPH WALTON (Yorkshire, Barnsley): Having travelled through the famine-stricken districts in India early this year, and having seen the terrible suffering of the population, I feel I must offer a few remarks in support of the proposal which has been made that India should be given a grant of £5,000,000 out of the Imperial Exchequer. I desire to bear testimony from my own personal observation to the most admirable and self-sacrificing manner in which officials, from the Viceroy down to the lowest official in India, are grappling with this terrible devastating famine which has spread over so wide an area and which is greater in relation to the number of people affected by it than possibly any famine which has ever occurred in the history of India. I think it would be a great act of sympathy if the House of Commons unanimously voted this money without a word of discussion, but I go beyond that, and I say that it would be an act of restitution to the people of India. We have a right to come to their assistance in this time of severe emergency. Lord Welby's Commission acknowledged that more than a quarter of a million annually was being overpaid to the Exchequer of this country from India, in connection with the financial arrangements between the two countries, and that it should be put an end to. But I should like to know whether this policy is not to be retrospective. We know that this sum of money at least has been exacted from the people of India for the last twenty years, which amounts to the £5,000,000 proposed in this resolution. If we grant it, we shall have had the benefit of the whole of the interest we have derived from that money, to which we have no just claim. Is it not also a fact that a third of the whole British Army is quartered in India, and that one-third of our Army Reserves are being created at the cost of India? I do not know how far that aspect of the question was taken into consideration by Lord Welby's Commission. We have been told to-night by the Chancellor of the Exchequer that the inhabitants of the native States of India have practically no claim on the sympathy and the financial aid of this country. I would ask the right hon. Gentleman whether it is or is not true that the Queen of England is Empress of the whole of India, and that every inhabitant of India is a subject of the

Empress? That being so, I venture to say that the inhabitants in the native States have an equal claim to our assistance and generosity as have the inhabitants of the States directly governed by us. We are told that India is to receive considerable financial relief by the fact of 20,000 troops from that country have gone to South Africa and to China to uphold the interests of the British Empire. We are told that that will mean a saving of at least £3,000,000 sterling. I find that the total net cost of the army in India is £15,000,000 sterling, and that 20,000 troops are just about a tenth of the whole native and European army, and therefore it appears to me that the utmost saving to the Exchequer of India that can be effected if these troops remain absent for a year will be one and a half millions, not three millions. With regard to the famine and to the measures which are necessary for the relief of its victims, my own view is that what is needed is a vigorous policy of opening up and developing India by the laying down of more railways, and especially the construction of irrigation works, so as to grapple with the question once for all and lessen immensely the probability of the recurrence of famine. I am sorry to notice that in connection with the heavy expenditure on famine relief it has been found necessary to reduce the amount spent on railway construction and irrigation works. When I was in Calcutta, in January last, I had an opportunity of discussing this whole question with the Viceroy. He is as keen on railway extension, and the construction of irrigation works as anyone can possibly be, and I know that he greatly regretted being obliged to stop the construction of railways in various parts of India on account of the special expenditure rendered necessary by the famine. But what I wish to submit to the House is whether there is any reason why the construction of railways should not proceed irrespective entirely of any special expenditure on famine. What are the facts? The railways of India last year, including military and famine lines, earned an average dividend of 5·32 per cent., and we know that by the construction of many feeder lines, which will pay well in themselves, the profitable character of the main lines is likely to be increased. That is the financial result of the whole railway system in India, and it can be improved still further. We know that reproductive public works have not given sufficient employment to the people of India; but we would not only be giving them present employment by opening up the country in this way, but works would be undertaken which would permanently give considerable employment to the people of India. In connection with the East India Railway, we find that they cannot get the Government of India to allow them to raise money which is so urgently required for the purpose of supplying the line with rolling stock. The other day a deputation of Calcutta merchants brought this matter specially under my notice. We find that the great East India Railway during the last twenty years has not only discharged nine millions of capital debt, but has also covered a capital expenditure of from six to seven millions, and has reduced its liability to the Government of India by twelve millions. At present the surplus profit from the East India Railway coming into the Exchequer is more than a million annually. What is the situation at present? One firm owning collieries had 30,000 tons of coal stocked at the collieries; they had ships waiting at Calcutta for it; and yet they could not get them loaded for six weeks because the railway company had not the necesssary rolling stock to carry the coal to the port of shipment. It is also true that wheat and seeds have been detained at railway stations for weeks together for want of trucks. A gentleman whom I only met to-day, and who owns large works in Calcutta, told me he had to cease work because he could not get coal from the collieries.

*Mr. SPEAKER: These observations are not relevant to the Amendment.

*Mr. JOSEPH WALTON: I had no intention of going beyond my right, and I will defer any further statement in regard to this matter until this particular Amendment has been disposed of; but perhaps I would be in order in urging that the proper way to deal with famine in India is by opening up and developing the country by railway extensions and the construction of irrigation works. I think I am justified in advocating that, by reason of the fact that the railways pay exceedingly well, as do also the irrigation works. The irrigation works last year

earned on an average a profit of 7 per cent. The interest was only 4 per cent., and therefore there was a clear profit of 3 per cent. which went into the Indian Exchequer. Is the financial position of India, after all, so bad that the work of constructing railways and the carrying on of irrigation works should not proceed? The railways of India earn 5·32 per cent., and I presume that money to extend them could be borrowed at 3½ per cent. I find in the explanatory statement that has been issued that, in taking account of the assets and liabilities of India, the capital value and not the present value is taken. I submit to the House that the 140 millions which is invested in railways earning 5⅓ per cent. is worth more than that capital sum, and, in the second place, that the irrigation works on which 23 millions have been spent, and which pay on an average 7 per cent., are certainly a marketable asset worth twice the amount they have cost. On that calculation the total realisable market value of our assets in India to-day would be 269 millions, whereas the total debt of India is only 212 millions, showing a surplus of 57 millions. Then, again, consider the enormous revenues from land. We got last year 16 millions from that source, which at twenty-five years purchase would be worth 400 millions. The only reason I quote these figures is that I hold that the financial position of India to-day is so excellent—there is no debt in the sense that we have a National Debt, because it is more than covered by revenue-producing assets—that we should be able to proceed with railway construction and irrigation works, irrespective altogether of the value of the telegraphs and public buildings, and the enormous revenues from land. Why, then, does not the Government of India deal with this question of railway construction and irrigation works on its merits? Why do they not separate the railway and irrigation accounts from the general finances of India? They would then have a splendid security, and they would be in a position to raise all the money they required for railway extension and irrigation works. I hope the right hon. Gentleman's sympathies will be with this proposal, and that he will be able to announce in the House to-night that at any rate he will give it favourable consideration, and that before long a separation of accounts may take place so that the opening up of India will not be retarded by any special expenditure in connection with famine. The extension of railways and irrigation works is the one practical way to increase the prosperity of India, and to prevent to a large extent the recurrence of famine, and even if famine did appear we should then be in a much better position to grapple with it.

Attention called to the fact that forty Members were not present (Dr. TANNER, Cork County, Mid). House counted, and forty Members being found present,

*SIR MANCHERJEE BHOWNAGGREE (Bethnal Green, N.E.): There is one feature with regard to the debate to-night on which I wish specially to express my thanks to Her Majesty's Government—namely, the unusually early date granted for the discussion of the Indian Budget. I welcome this arrangement, as it has been considered a grievance in India that almost the only definite opportunity this House has of discussing questions affecting that country is postponed to the last night of the session. The present change will be regarded with satisfaction in India, and I trust that it will be allowed to form a precedent in future years. I am pleased to find that all the Amendments on the Order Paper relating to the Budget have reference to the famine, which evinces the great concern which the House as a whole feels about the terrible calamity from which India is suffering, and this sympathy by the representatives of the nation will be regarded with a sense of gratitude by the people of that country. But as the particular motion now before the House does not embrace all the points covered by the several Amendments, I wish, Mr. Speaker, to ask your decision as to whether it would be in order to refer to those points, and especially to the one with regard to the development of technical and industrial instruction, which forms the subject-matter of the Amendment standing in my name as follows—

"That the spread of famine and scarcity over extensive areas and affecting millions of inhabitants in India, although recurring at irregular intervals, may be regarded as a certain calamity to which that country is periodically exposed; that the disastrous consequences of such visitation are rendered unconquerable by the fact that an unusually

large proportion of its population is allowed to remain dependent for its livelihood upon agricultural labour exclusively, whereas nearly all other industrial pursuits, for which the natural resources of the country offer wide scope, are neglected; that one of the most effective methods by which the rigour of the famines could be modified, and the buying power of the people now succumbing to them increased, would be to enable large classes of the agricultural population to pursue other industries; and that, therefore, it is the opinion of this House that the Government of India should adopt measures for the elementary industrial and technical instruction of the poorer communities, so as to fit them for more profitable manual labour in other directions besides agriculture."

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member will be in order in dealing with any method of relieving the famine, or any measure which he thinks would prevent its recurrence.

SIR MANCHERJEE BHOWNAGGREE: Of the several methods suggested there are four which deserve special attention as being calculated to mitigate the rigours of future famines, if not altogether to prevent their recurrence, either by lessening the burden upon the taxpayer, or by increasing the production of wealth in the country. Modifications in the different systems of assessment, and the adoption of protective measures against undue and uncertain enhancements, are admitted to have a close bearing upon the ultimate prosperity of the cultivator, and I am glad to find that the Government of India has before it important material in connection with these questions, as well as with regard to the question of elasticity, which is engrossing its attention. It seems to me a sound principle that enhancement should be regulated on the ground of an increase in prices. From the discussion in the Viceroy's Council on the last Financial Statement it is satisfactory to note that the revised Estimates were less than those of the Budget by 83 lakhs of rupees in Bombay, and by 35½ lakhs and 38 lakhs in the Central Provinces and the Punjab, respectively, and that for the coming year large reductions are already promised in the estimates which were originally based on a favourable anticipation. The surplus shown in the revised Budget, in spite of adverse circumstances, is due in a great measure to the steady increase in the earnings of railways and irrigation works, and this fully justifies the provision of a crore of rupees for the extension of irrigation works, to which as a remedy against famines Lord Curzon has wisely directed his attention. Under the head of "Reduction of Expenditure" might be included a readjustment of the cost of maintaining in India forces which are required to perform Imperial duties. We have had considerable and valuable testimony from competent statesmen that the Indian foreign policy was determined by Imperial rather than Indian considerations, and I hail the announcement made by Lord Onslow in another place a few nights ago that Her Majesty's Government are willing to accept the recommendations of the Commission, and to give at least £250,000, and probably more, towards the relief of the revenues of India; that Her Majesty's Government desire to treat India not only equitably, but liberally; and that if time were given them they hoped to give effect to other recommendations of the Royal Commission. I trust Her Majesty's Government will go a good deal further in their final action on those recommendations, and see their way to make further concessions in the direction in which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton has made so eloquent an appeal to-night for an ampler measure of justice to India. I also gladly welcome the determination of the Government to accept the recommendation of the Commission as to referring to arbitration questions in dispute that may arise between the Imperial and the Indian Governments. The interests of India, safeguarded as they are, no doubt, by the Secretary of State and the Viceroy, are apt to be brushed aside if submitted to the final determination of the Cabinet alone. But if, upon any question in which the authority directly connected with India differs from the Imperial authority, the points upon which they differed were referred to arbitration, it would go far to convince the people of India that the final decision arrived at was a fair and just one. I would now refer, lastly, to the great cause which leads to the impoverishment of the resources of India, and exposes her population to the ravages of scarcity and famine, which is not inaptly called the drain of the wealth of India. Under this head political thinkers and speakers include a great many questions, such as the large civil and military expenditure of the

* See page 610 of this volume.

country, the home charges, the interest paid on foreign capital, and so forth, and they have their different panacea for these evils. To my mind, this great drain, the existence of which cannot be denied, is due to the enormous volume of foreign manufactured articles which are imported into the country. India pays out somewhere about fifty millions of tens of rupees under this head every year, or, to do away with what Lord Curzon very aptly termed "the dreadful and bewildering symbol of Rx.," a sum exceeding £33,000,000. Against this huge figure the value of manufactured articles exported from India is absolutely insignificant, so that the conclusion is undeniable that the manufacturing capacity of the country is infinitesimal. On former occasions I have quoted figures and statistics to prove this, and I shall not trouble the House by going over the ground again. When I first drew attention to this subject I was misunderstood and misrepresented by a certain class of people who imagined that my object was to discredit high literary education in India. Even my hon. friend the Member for Dumfriesshire was misled in that way, but I should be very much mistaken indeed if he is still of that opinion. It is naturally gratifying to me that the arguments I then advanced have found wide acceptance, and the necessity for the propagation of such industrial and technical teaching as might fit the people of India to bestow skilled labour upon the natural materials which are found in such abundance in their country is recognised. The interest evinced in this matter by the noble Lord and the Viceroy must be gratefully acknowledged. I regard the development of instruction in this direction as the most important of all remedies suggested against the terrible affliction of the oft-recurring famines. I shall briefly illustrate this by alluding to the fact that 90 per cent. of the population of India subsists on agricultural pursuits, and that if we succeed in withdrawing say, even 10 per cent. from this occupation, we at once reduce by so much the burden on the soil, and increase the productive power of that 10 per cent. by teaching them to turn raw material into articles of domestic use, every one of which nearly they now import from foreign countries. Owing to the scarcity of fodder in the present famine, large numbers of cattle have perished. I am told that for want of skilled manipulation, the hides were exported to foreign countries at the ridiculously low price of a few annas a-piece. These same skins will return to the country in the shape of manufactured goods. If the natives were taught to manufacture such goods, to how many hundreds of thousands of people would this very material furnish lucrative occupation, and how much money on this one head be retained in the country? This is what might be said with respect to horns, bones, seeds, and almost every variety of material which is to be found copiously in India. In short, the extension of industrial enterprise would stop the enormous drain on the resources of India, and furnish the means of subsistence to a large number of those who succumb so easily to the ravages of famine. Gratifying as is the fact that the need for such teaching as might make this enterprise possible is widely and even authoritatively recognised, it is necessary that some steps should be taken to supply that need, and means devised to provide the necessary instruction. I have often been confronted with the argument that the people of India are averse to such education, and asked how it is possible to get a people to adopt trades or industries to which they are not inclined and would not take kindly; but the answer is plain. The mission of the British Government in India is absolutely a paternal one, and it places an obligation upon them to guide the people of the country. It is no excuse for the Government to say "The people do not want it, and will not do it"; that is not the position that ought to be taken up. It is the duty of the Government to find out what is good for the people of India, and then place such means at their disposal as they might be induced to adopt. All the schools in the villages and towns throughout the country should be provided with workshops and scientific laboratories, on a scale proportionate to their size and capacity, and by that means the people of India would be brought to see the desirability and the necessity of adapting themselves to the pursuit of industries of a lucrative character. At present the education of India proceeds in the direction of making the people literary scholars, which is right enough in its due proportion, but a nation of literary scholars is not one that is likely to advance in the paths of prosperity.

The bulk of a prosperous nation must be composed of people skilled in industrial arts and crafts, and it is the duty of the British Government to remedy the gross ignorance of India in that respect. If the people could be induced to gradually enter upon the manufacture of even one-fifth of the articles which are now imported, and which have entered into their daily wants, and which they are now compelled to purchase, famine would to a large extent disappear. I submit that this is the most effectual way of subduing the effects of this curse that overwhelms India periodically. This is the root cure for the future. Meanwhile, for the present, we have not only the prevailing famine, but unfortunately a dismal prospect for the coming year. Reports from India about the rainfall are alarming, and there is promise of continuous scarcity. This has enhanced the disappointment with which I heard the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. When the right hon. Gentleman rose to speak, I fully expected he would make some announcement which would carry comfort to the hearts of the people who are in such dire distress, and that, at all events, he would hold out some hope of help. But the argument which he mainly employed was that Great Britain could not spare money for an adequate grant, because her Exchequer was poorer than that of India. This statement will be read to-morrow everywhere with surprise and even consternation. The right hon. Gentleman further argued that the credit of India was unshaken, and that she can borrow more than she requires for her needs. No doubt the credit of India is as good to-day in the midst of her sufferings as it ever was, and she can draw upon her credit as largely as she chooses for the purpose of obtaining relief, more especially as it is generally known that England is at her back; but a nation in this respect is like a man, who might have any amount of credit, but who, if he drew upon it too largely, would become a helpless bankrupt, and ultimately perish.

MR. WYNDHAM: In such a case the Government would come to her assistance.

*SIR MANCHERJEE BHOWNAGGREE: I am grateful for that assurance. I make no claim on the part of India on the ground of right, of her past wrongs, or anything of the kind. I only appeal to the benevolence of the British nation, and to the high Imperial instincts which have recently been shown by the nation in various ways, so that India may feel that her relationship with England is not merely one of pounds, shillings and pence, but that England will stand by India to-day as India has stood by England whenever called upon to do so. I remember during the time of the American War, when there was a great crisis in the Manchester cotton trade, how the merchant princes of Bombay sent stupendous aid to Lancashire.

MR. MACLEAN: They were making their fortunes out of it.

*SIR MANCHERJEE BHOWNAGGREE: I am surprised at my hon. friend, after his speech to-night, using this argument against the appeal I am making. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, I do not base my appeal as any sort of claim whatsoever. I would not hark back on the past, or I might be tempted to dwell on the various instances in which the Indian Exchequer was unjustifiably burdened with large payments on account of the Persian and Abyssinian expeditions, the entertainment of the Sultan, the demonstration at Malta, and the Egyptian campaigns. I only plead for a generous grant in this time of India's need, on the ground that it would be essentially the sort of charity that covereth a multitude of sins. I make my appeal because I feel that amid our present distractions, and owing to the numerous calls that have been made on its purpose, this nation has not fully acted up to its noble traditions for sympathy with suffering fellow-subjects. A few days ago I made an appeal to the Archbishop of Canterbury, the concluding words of which I would take the liberty of reading to the House—

"As head of a Church the beneficence of whose operations and whose resources for doing good are practically boundless, I venture to appeal to your Grace in this time of India's direful need to make a call upon this nation for succour and relief. A day of general prayer and intercession, to be followed by a collection, in all the churches, would provide such a remedy. Divine grace thus supplicated would not be withheld, while the donations of the religious-minded specially called for from innumerable pulpits would result in a copious flow of that material help which would sensibly mitigate the evils of this gigantic

calamity. Should it please your Grace to take my appeal into your favourable consideration, I need scarcely say that you will earn the unuttered blessings of countless masses of our suffering fellow-subjects in India, endear the Church to their hearts in its charitable aspects, and demonstrate as has never been done before to three hundred millions of the inhabitants of that country the benevolence, the potency, and the saving grace of Christian prayer and Christian charity."

The Archbishop's reply to that appeal was to the effect that it would be best for intending subscribers to send all contributions to the Mansion House Fund. Such a reply from the highest dignitary of the Church showed unmistakably that the heart and conscience of the nation had not been awakened. On this ground I urge that it is the clear duty of the Government to make a grant, and I trust that the decision announced by the Chancellor of the Exchequer will be reconsidered. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would make an appeal to hon. Members opposite. If they really mean to serve India in this time of her distress, I would ask them not to press the motion for a grant to a division. We know that the division will be on the usual party lines, and the motion will be rejected by a large majority. It will be regarded as a decision which confirms and stereotypes the unfortunate declaration that has been made; but if the appeal for a grant is allowed to rest on the expression of views that has taken place to-night and which will be echoed in the press to-morrow, there may be some hope of a favourable consideration of this question before long.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.): I am not going to follow the hon. Gentleman in any of the arguments he has placed before the House. I will merely say that I do not think that he drew the right inference as to the amount of interest that there is in the motion under discussion. I believe that the country and the House are deeply moved at the distress in India through this famine, and I desire to add my personal appreciation of the closing remarks of the noble Lord, the pathos of whose words, to my mind, was expressive of the sincerity of the deep feeling of this country. I much regret that the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer made the speech he did. Though I quite see that there may be reasons why the Government could not accept this resolution, I object to the grounds which he gave for coming to that conclusion. I agree with the hon. Gentleman opposite that the comparison which the right hon. Gentleman drew with regard to the Exchequers was entirely fallacious, and one which will not bear the grip of argument for a moment. With regard to the famine now raging in India, I feel that no words are too strong to express our admiration for the way in which all officials responsible for the famine administration at the present time are doing their duty. From the highest officer down to the humblest official, whether English or Indian, they are doing their duty. They are doing duties which, if done on the field of battle, would have been made known to the world, and would have won the admiration of the public generally. They are doing their work silently, loyally, and unwitnessed, and I am sure that this House and the country cordially endorse all that has been said in praise of what they have done. The fact is, as has already been pointed out by the noble Lord, this is the greatest famine of the century, and the most widespread in its effects. We must remember that cholera in its most fatal form has been added to the horrors of the famine, and that has made the situation still more serious. In many districts in India the people had scarcely recovered from the effects of the famine of three years ago when they received this second blow. I do not desire to dwell to-night in any way on certain mistakes which have been made in the famine administration. I will only call attention to two things which I think have been unfortunate. First of all, there was the massing of the sufferers in relief camps distant from villages. I would also note the fact that the people receiving relief are paid a minimum of wages cut down to the starvation point. These things have had the effect, I think, of intensifying the evils resulting from the famine. No doubt when this famine is over there will be an inquiry into the whole circumstances. I am not going in any way to anticipate what will be the result of that inquiry. I would rather refer for a few moments to one or two of the remedies which I think are essential before India can be placed in a position satisfactorily to resist the awful consequences of these famines. It is a commonplace to say that the immediate cause of all these famines is

the lack of rainfall. No possible remedy can affect that immediate cause, but I think all hon. Members will agree with me when I say that it is possible to make such changes in regard to the position of the great masses of the population in India who are peculiarly liable to the effects of famine as will make them stronger to resist its effects. I will mention one or two of these remedies which I think would permanently improve the position of the cultivators of the soil in India. My hon. friend below me has already referred to the need of extending irrigation works. I am not going into this question at any length, but I would like heartily to associate myself with what he said. There is need for extending irrigation works for famine-protective purposes in India. I notice that Lord Curzon in his speech at his Council in March last complained a little of the insistence of a certain number of those interested in India in this country upon this point. He said that apparently we were not aware that already a great deal had been done in the way of providing irrigation works for the purpose of preventing famine. That is perfectly true. What we say is, we think a great deal more ought to be done than has been done already. We have spent in India up to 1897 the enormous sum of £250,000,000, or thereabouts, upon the construction of railways. We have only spent £32,000,000 upon the construction of irrigation works. I think that that is a great disproportion, which ought not to exist, between these two kinds of public works, which have mainly for their purpose the prevention and the amelioration of famine. Of course the objection is made that you cannot make canals in high and hilly countries. This is a difficulty which no doubt prevails over a large portion of the Central Provinces of India. I reply to that—if canals are impossible, lakes are not. I would remind the House that there is a large number of storage tanks in certain districts of India, especially in the Central Provinces. They have been used throughout history in India. They have been a practical method for alleviating the horrors of famine, and I will ask whether it is not possible to construct storage tanks, at least in such districts as I have named in the Central Provinces, if it cannot be done elsewhere. If we cannot erect these storage tanks, what about wells? There are in Northern India a great number of these wells, and they could be, I venture to assert, multiplied to almost any extent. In concluding what I have to say on irrigation works, I would like to remind the House, and especially the noble Lord opposite, if he will allow me, that there was a specific recommendation in the Famine Commission Report of 1898, on this subject. It stated this—

"As the State in India is generally in the position of superior landlord, there are special reasons why the Government should undertake, without expectation of direct return, works peculiarly protective of agriculture, such as irrigation works."

I venture to say that this is a sound piece of advice. Although the Government have not had a very long time to carry out that recommendation, I hope the noble Lord will to-night be able to say that they agree with the policy which underlies the statement. I hope also the noble Lord will be able to give the House some information in regard to the attitude of the Government to the Madras Irrigation Bill, which embodies a point of policy with the most direct connection with the question of famine. As some hon. Members may be aware, the Government of Madras passed a Bill making the irrigation rate compulsory. This is a most retrograde policy. It is contrary to the distinct recommendation of the Commission I have already alluded to. It is contrary to the universal usage in India, and there is no reason why this change should be made. That is a change which means that, in regard to Madras, there shall be a compulsory rate for the use of water from irrigation works, because, as my hon. friend below me has already pointed out, the interest earned by the irrigation works upon the whole is about 7 per cent.—at all events, it is over 6 per cent. I should point out also that the policy that underlies this Madras Bill is contrary to the position taken up by more than one previous Secretary of State with regard to similar legislation. Thirty years ago a similar measure was proposed, and the Duke of Argyll who was Secretary of State for India at the time, for three specific reasons refused his sanction. I am not going to trouble the House with the reasons in detail, but they were in the first place that a canal might not be able to supply for irrigation purposes the expected quantity of water; secondly, that the

expected quantity being available, cultivators might decline to avail themselves to the expected extent; and thirdly, that excessive costliness of construction might, in order to render a canal remunerative, necessitate the imposition of higher rates than cultivators could afford or would voluntarily pay. If these three reasons against making the rate compulsory in regard to these works were valid in 1870, they are valid to-day. I hope the noble Lord will be able to give us some ground for hoping that he will not sanction this particular Bill. As the hon. Member for Cardiff has already pointed out, the root of the famine is the land question. India is an agricultural country. I agree with the hon. Member opposite entirely that it is of the utmost importance we should develop, as far as we can, the industrial resources of India, and I think he will also agree with me when I say that it will take many decades before India can hope to compete with the capital, the skill, and the science of Europe. Even when this does take place, the great masses of India will depend primarily upon agriculture. Therefore, in dealing with the land question in India with regard to famine, you are dealing with an issue of vital and permanent importance. I would like to make one or two remarks as to the principle regulating land assessment in India, and to point out that these facts have a direct bearing upon the consequences of the famine. Take, first, the principle now obtaining in Northern India. I will content myself with simply showing what the system there is. After a number of reductions had been made on the scale of assessment about fifty years ago, it was finally fixed at 50 per cent. of the rental. The system is to allow the landlord and the tenant to make their own arrangements, and then the State comes in and takes 50 per cent. of the rental. It is interesting to note that the then Governor of the North-west Provinces, Sir Antony MacDonnell, a man of the largest experience, and a most distinguished public servant in India, points out that this means, generally speaking, 8 to 10 per cent. of the gross produce of the soil. The arrangement has worked well hitherto, and I wish to suggest that it would be most desirable that a similar limit should be placed in regard to land assessment in the Southern Provinces of India. Just one word as to Madras and Bombay. Here the matter stands in a very different condition. As hon. Members know, the Government deal direct with the cultivators. The rent in many cases is excessive, and the cultivators are in a state of chronic poverty. I will only mention one fact to prove that statement. I find on reading the Report of the Famine Commission of 1878 the statement—

> "The Government takes in rent not from 8 to 10 per cent. of the gross produce, as in Northern India, but from 12 to 31 per cent."

I am afraid if the present day facts were examined the matter would be still worse in regard to that point. As to Bombay, the only evidence I will trouble the House with is what is divulged in the Crop Experiments Report in reference to the relation between the assessments. I find that, judging from the results of these experiments, it has been discovered with regard to the Presidency of Bombay that the assessment is very high, and that in some cases it reaches a scale of 42, 67, and even 96 per cent. of the gross product of the soil. Without wearying the House with any further facts and figures, I will content myself with simply pointing out that it seems to me plain that there is an inevitable connection between the scale of assessment and the present famine in these districts. With regard to the Central Provinces, I will remind the House that six years ago an enhancement took place of similar dimensions. Rents advanced from 20 per cent. to 105 per cent., and the effect of this enhancement has been inevitable. People are afraid to embark capital in the land, and when famine comes, as it has come to that district to-day, the people are practically helpless to resist it. The moral of these facts is written, I believe, very plainly in the history of the famines in India. I do not wish to say that it is only in those districts where land assessment is very high that famines ever come. What I do say is that an examination of the facts of the case proves beyond doubt that it is just in those districts that famines are always most severe. For instance, in 1877, as the House knows, it was in Madras that 5,000,000 died of famine, and in 1897 and 1900 it was in the Central Provinces where the famine seemed to have the worst results. To-day it is in Bombay. It is in these three districts and Presidencies that land assessments are higher than they are in any other portion of

India. The House will ask, "In the face of these facts, what do you suggest?" I do not recommend a universal system. That would be obviously impossible. I do not recommend the extension throughout India of the permanent settlement. I do not recommend the creation of landlords in Bombay and Madras, as in other parts of India. What I do suggest is that an equitable limit should be fixed to the land revenue demanded by the Government, and that reasonable security should be given to tenants that this rate will continue. What do hon. Members think would be an equitable limit to impose with regard to land assessment? I would suggest this practical solution of the difficulty. I should suggest as to the limit that it should not exceed in any single area 20 per cent. of the gross product of the soil. Where you take an entire district into account, the limit should be 10 per cent. It is quite obvious that, if for famine purposes it is necessary to bring about some changes in the way of moderating the land charges throughout India, you must have money to do it. It is perfectly foolish to suggest that these reforms should be carried out and the remedies applied unless you are at the same time to make some suggestion as to the source from which the money required is to come. The remedy proposed in the resolution is for a temporary and exceptional state of things. It does not go to the root of the matter, and will not be a permanent remedy. I would suggest that there is one source from which a large portion of the expenditure of India might be justly and reasonably curtailed, and that is the military charges now imposed on the Indian Exchequer should be reduced. I do not think I should be in order in going into the reasons that obtain——

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Gentleman is discussing a question that does not come within the scope of this Amendment.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS: I said I would be out of order in going into details on that point. The hon. Member below me who moved the resolution spoke of the claim India had for some reduction in regard to this matter.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! That hon. Member in speaking on that matter was speaking on the main question, but it cannot be discussed on the motion now before the House.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS: If I cannot refer to it, it will be impossible for me to give even briefly my suggestion as to where the money required for bringing about this should come from. There was one remark the Chancellor of the Exchequer made in his speech which was not in any way sound. In reference to the fact that we are now making use of Indian troops in China and South Africa, he said that we pay in full for these services, and that therefore the Government of this country ought not to be asked for any assistance to India on that account. It seems to me that that is not an adequate reply to the question. The fact that we pay for the services of these troops while abroad does not in any way compensate for the fact that they are held in India, and that such a large sum of money is expended on them permanently for Indian purposes. I feel that in this direction we shall find some day a solution of the financial aspect of the question. I am glad that we have had an opportunity of discussing this question. I am grateful to the First Lord of the Treasury for giving us an opportunity earlier than the last day of the session for doing it. I regret deeply that the Government have found it impossible to acquiesce in the Amendment, but I do not altogether despair that the day is not far distant when they will reconsider their conclusion. If they do so I feel that the granting to India of a generous gift upon this trying occasion in the history of the Indian Empire will have results of the most wide-reaching and salutary effect.

*SIR EDGAR VINCENT (Exeter): It appears to me that the decision come to upon the motion before the House must depend in a large measure upon the opinion which is formed as to the financial position of India. It is quite clear that the decision with regard to the grant of £5,000,000 we are called upon to make depends to a large extent on the opinion we hold with respect to two questions—namely, is India in a position to pay? And, secondly, is it to the permanent advantage of India that England should pay this free grant? With regard to the first question I do not perceive in the arguments brought forward in favour of the motion any real

attempt to prove that the finances of India are in such a condition that they are incapable of standing the strain of the present famine. If we look at the tables presented to us, what do we find? We find that there have been surpluses in the last two years averaging about £2,500,000 sterling. If we look at the commerce of the country, we see no sign whatever of diminution or exhaustion. On the other side of the tables I do see that during the last two years a reform—a great and permanent improvement of financial value—has been carried out. I think insufficient attention has been paid to the reform which has been executed with respect to the currency. It is within the knowledge of the House that during the last twenty years the one great danger of India, the great bane, not only of Indian finance, but of Indian commerce and administration, has been that proceeding from the fluctuations of exchange. I believe that the noble Lord the Secretary of State and the Indian Government are entitled to claim that in the course of the year under review they have practically solved that question. It is undoubtedly true that the immediate results of the reform of 1893 were disappointing, but the Committee presided over by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton deserve the greatest credit for having perceived, in the midst of apparent failure, those elements which made for final and complete success. The redundancy of silver currency existing in 1893 could only be worked off by degrees. That absorption of the rupee has now taken place, and I believe we have attained a position of assured equilibrium. Surely that is a circumstance which should not be lost sight of in considering any question of a grant to India, or any question affecting the strength or weakness of the Indian financial position. On the second point, namely, whether it is to the permanent advantage of India that England should pay this free grant of £5,000,000, I admit that there are strong substantial reasons, which I do not at all underrate, for being generous, and if I argue the question, I will not do so from the point of view of the English exchequer or the burdens now incumbent upon English taxpayers. I would prefer to view the question from the point of view of Indian financial administration. It has been my fortune to be intimately concerned with the finance of several countries somewhat similarly situated to India, and I am sure of this, that had similar circumstances presented themselves I should have been opposed to a grant of this kind, and for various reasons, which I will state with all deference to the House. In the first place the right hon. Gentleman who spoke recently said that every country has its dignity in these matters, and that it is undesirable, unless it is absolutely necessary, to go to the English Exchequer *in forma pauperis*. Were India to fall back upon assistance from England there would be distinct deterioration. Leaving aside the question of dignity let us examine the question of practical administration. I have no doubt whatever that the task of the Financial Minister at Calcutta would be rendered considerably more difficult were this assistance to be given, because it is impossible for assistance of that kind to be given without its being considered, rightly or wrongly, as a precedent. We may say that here the circumstances are exceptional, and will never occur again. I wish I could take so optimistic a view. I am certain that if a grant is given to-night, or in the course of the present year, circumstances generally similar to those now present will recur, and recur very shortly, while the power of resistance will diminish. I believe that the forces which work under all Governments for extravagance, and work with particular strength under a military Government, which I take that of India to be, to a large extent would gain force. The military Members, who have always a great many reforms they desire, would say, "Well, if Indian resources are insufficient you know perfectly well you have only to turn to Downing Street, and from the Treasury you will receive the assistance you require." I am convinced that the Members who have most experience in the financial administration of States will agree with me that it is essentially important that a country should remain financially independent, and that it should sail, if I may be permitted to use the expression, upon its own bottom. It does not appear to me that sufficient proof has been afforded that real difficulty has arisen in India. I rather incline to the view that the present difficulty and the present stress is due in some measure to the fact that the Indian Government, somewhat like the ryot, does not in

the days of prosperity make sufficient provision for those years of famine which inevitably come. Although I differ from the hon. and right hon. Gentlemen who have spoken in favour of a Vote from England, I agree with them to some extent in this, that I do not consider the present system of administration of famine relief and insurance to be altogether satisfactory. It appears to me that the Indian Government have put their case forward somewhat unwisely. Their administration of famine relief may be sound, but in giving an account of their stewardship they have created distrust and suspicion. Mr. Dawkins says that a new departure will be taken in regard to this fund. As the programme of railway works destined to relieve famine has been nearly exhausted, and the programme of irrigation works has been largely reduced, there will be a considerable balance of money unexpended on famine relief. The Secretary of State proposes to devote that sum to public works which without it would have to be met by incurring new debt. In other words, the Public Works Department will borrow from the famine relief fund instead of from the market. Is this a solution of the question? I admit that it is an advance on the present practice. That money will figure as an asset in the books of the Famine Relief Department, and as a liability in the books of the Public Works Department; but I should criticise the proposal from this point of view, that a departmental entry is not a commercial realisable asset in the ordinary sense of the word. I am convinced that the only satisfactory plan of meeting these recurring famines in India is to constitute such a reserve, either from surpluses or from an annual Vote, as shall place the Government of India in a position of assured independence, and as shall enable them to deal with famine in a more free and decided manner than would be now either justifiable or possible. Under the plan which I venture to advocate this annual sum or sums would be placed to the credit of an extraordinary fund, which would be invested in high-class non-Indian securities, and would be available to meet unforeseen emergencies without recurrence to English support. The Indian financial situation appears to me not to want relief by a grant-in-aid from London, but to require broader treatment. The management of a great exchequer does not consist merely in bringing in money, in reducing balances, and in saving interest. You cannot conduct the finances of a great empire on the same principle as the finances of a money-dealer or a bill-broker. The effect which your measures will have upon the mind of the financial world, and the impression you create upon the imagination of the taxpayers in India, are circumstances which must be taken into account. I hold it to be of supreme importance that in a country like India the population should realise that the Government is strong and wealthy, and disposes of ample resources to meet any emergency. During the recent famine I have seen it stated in an Indian newspaper that it was most undesirable for the Government to appeal to private benevolence lest it should be thought that they were in financial straits, and that they were obliged to appeal to individuals in India and in this country in order to give that relief to suffering which their straitened circumstances rendered them unable to furnish themselves. I contend that the mere fact that such a statement is made shows not that there is anything wrong with the financial administration of the country, but that there is something wrong with the method by which the results are brought before the public. I have a clear opinion regarding the financial soundness and prosperity of India, and I differ by the whole breadth of the heavens from those who think that India is either overtaxed or misgoverned. I differ no less strongly from those who think it is good policy to make India appear poor so as to diminish the financial burdens which may be cast upon her. My conviction is that the only right course is for the Government to make the finances strong and to let them appear strong. I would constitute such a reserve as would put this question beyond doubt, and I would invest that reserve not as is now proposed, in a departmental entry, but in such a manner as to show that it is a financial asset which is realisable, which the Government can fall back upon in times of distress, and which would enable the Government to deal with famine or war in a thoroughly efficient and satisfactory manner. It is within the memory of all that in Egypt, at a time when that country had gone through greater financial straits than

India has ever been placed in, the moment years of prosperity commenced it was decided to apply all surpluses to the constitution of a reserve fund. Those who are acquainted with the administration of Egypt will agree with me that the existence of that reserve fund, which now amounts to about four millions sterling, has been the corner stone of all subsequent financial operations, and that it has imparted to Egyptian finance a strength and vigour and elasticity which appear to me to be somewhat lacking in a country of much greater strength—namely, India. The noble Lord the Secretary of State for India has had the rare privilege of having relieved India of one grave financial danger—that of the fluctuation of exchange. I hope that the noble Lord will crown this considerable achievement by establishing in India a reserve which will place the Government in a position of assured financial security. I believe that this is the way in which future famines can be dealt with, and the remedy which I venture to propose is one of a permanent character, and not one merely a temporary relief like a grant-in-aid. The present scale of taxation in India in a normal year should leave at least a surplus of £3,000,000 sterling to constitute a reserve fund, and to this may be added the profit which will be realised upon the coinage of silver. I do hope that we shall in future abandon the practice adopted in past years of dissipating the surplus in small Departmental doles. Let the noble Lord in future adopt the bold and courageous policy of constituting a material and an effective, a public and manifest, reserve. If he adopts this course, I am convinced that the financial clouds which now obscure—and which have for so long obscured—the finances of our great Indian dependency will roll apart, and the peace, the prosperity, and the happiness of the inhabitants of that great Empire will be notably enhanced and confirmed.

MR. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.): I have followed with the closest attention the able speech which has been delivered by the hon. Member who has just sat down. The only remark I wish to make in regard to that speech is that, so far as my memory serves me, the mode of creating a famine fund which he has just sketched out was, in substance, the plan upon which the famine fund was originally established, and which successive Governments of India have, for good reasons or for bad, diverted from its original application. But, whatever be the merits of the plan, it seems rather to be concerned with the future than with the immediate present, and it is not, I venture to say, very intimately associated with the question which is now before the House—namely, the condition in which the Indian people are found at the present time. I listened very closely and with much interest a little while ago to the speech of the hon. Member for North-East Bethnal Green, and I may say that I cordially agree with him in the disappointment which he expressed at the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. I only regret that at the conclusion of his speech the hon. Gentleman announced that he would not have the courage to support his views by his vote in this House.

*SIR MANCHERJEE BHOWNAGGREE: I must object to that phrase, because I made my meaning perfectly clear, and explained that in the best interests of India I wished the motion should not be divided on, as it was sure to be defeated.

MR. PICKERSGILL: I am perfectly aware of what the hon. Member said, but I think the excuse he gave for supporting the Government was a very thin pretext.

*SIR MANCHERJEE BHOWNAGGREE: I rise, Mr. Speaker, to a point of order. I am accused of opposing this Amendment upon a thin pretext, when I have absolutely given adequate reasons for the course I intend to take. Is the hon. Member in order in using that language?

*MR. SPEAKER: I do not think the hon. Member has said anything which is out of order.

MR. PICKERSGILL: I say again that it is the thinnest pretext I ever heard advanced. The hon. Member said that the relations between this country and India were the relations of a benevolent Imperialism. The only commentary I desire to make upon the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer is that it seems to me that both the benevolence

and the Imperialism were conspicuously absent. One is always willing to make allowances for the position of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. But after all, a Chancellor of the Exchequer is a Minister of the Crown, and I rather think that when the people of this country read the arguments by which the right hon. Gentleman has opposed the proposal which has been made from these benches they will feel humiliated. What are the arguments which he used? The first was that the present was an unfavourable time for making such a demand upon the national credit. He mentioned the burden which the war in South Africa had laid upon him. All that is true, but it does not seem to me that this unhappy war in South Africa, in which the Government has involved the country, should be permitted to relieve this country from its obligation towards our Indian fellow-subjects. If we are to take the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer as representing the views of the Government, then we know exactly where we stand. We know from his statement that this war in South Africa is not only to prevent the fulfilment of the promises which the Government made to the people of this country, and to stand in the way of much-needed social reforms in England, but it is also to prevent the fulfilment of our obligations to the people of India, and prevent us assuming our proper position in relation to the affairs of China. This South African War seems to me to have weakened, humiliated, and paralysed the action of the Government in almost every quarter of the globe. The second argument of the right hon. Gentleman seemed to me, if possible, even more extraordinary than the first. The right hon. Gentleman said that he understood the bulk of this money which we are voting would go not for the benefit of British India, which is under the immediate government of the Crown, but as to the bulk of it would go to benefit the Native States. I will show that that is not so; but supposing it were so, the right hon. Gentleman knows that we interfere with the internal affairs of these Native States. To a large extent we prevent them governing themselves according to old Oriental methods, and insist on them adopting Western methods. It shows a curious want of the Imperial instinct when the right hon. Gentleman repudiates all responsibility for these Native States. The Indian Famine Paper issued this morning gives us the means of calculating roughly, but not inaccurately, the proportions in which this fund will go to the benefit of British India and the Native States. The grants which the Government propose to make are to be divided in the proportions of twenty-six lakhs to the Native States and fifty-five lakhs to British India. This question can hardly be decided without considering how far the Government has discharged its duty towards the Indian people. I cordially recognise the self-sacrificing efforts of the Civil servants in coping with this famine. They have not spared themselves; they have given their health, and even their lives, to the cause, and not a few of them have used their own pecuniary resources in aid of the famine-stricken people. What I want to do is to attack the system, not the men who administer it. The right hon. Gentleman stated this afternoon that over 11,000 natives had been crowded in a relief camp, and that terrible mortality had broken out, that the people ran away and carried the infection to other districts. He said that that was an exceptional case, but I question whether it was really exceptional. If we are to believe the testimony of credible and authentic observers, it was not an exceptional case. There were many places like it in the Bombay Presidency. There were camps in which 30,000 people were crowded together, and that was directly contrary to the Code, which lays down that relief works camps should be limited to 5,000 persons. What was the effect of having these large crowded camps? They became the centres of disease. Mr. Nash tells us that the Government of India knew perfectly well that cholera would inevitably break out in these camps, yet they did not take medical precautions which they ought to have taken; nor did they provide an adequate service of medical men in order to cope with the danger. The second point which I wish to emphasise is the incalculable loss of cattle during this famine. Now, could that loss of cattle have been avoided? The cattle died because there was no fodder for them; but there was plenty of fodder in other parts of India, and the cattle died because the fodder was not brought to the spots where the cattle were. If the testimony of competent observers is true, the transport of fodder hopelessly broke

down. Mr. Nash, the correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian*, says that there was plenty of fodder ready packed for transport. Big stacks of grass running into hundreds of thousands of tons were stacked along the railway lines in the Central Provinces, and the whole of it was allowed to rot, and the few cattle left were allowed to die. The transport was ineffective, and unnecessarily aggravated the loss of cattle. The right hon. Gentleman, in the course of his very interesting speech, referred to the relations between the rulers of India and the ruled. He said there was an amount of sympathy between the Government of India and the people to an extent which had not prevailed in former years. But I would respectfully ask the right hon. Gentleman whether his own conscience is altogether clear in this matter, and whether the relations between England and India and between the Government and the governed in India have been improved by the recent changes carried through in the Indian Council. I would ask him whether he thinks that these relations of sympathy were promoted by the harsh treatment given the brothers Natu, who were imprisoned for two years without trial, and in relation to whom the charges on which they were arrested were changed from time to time, and they were at last released without any charge having been established against them. I ask him further whether these relations of sympathy are likely to be promoted by what has happened at Cawnpore? I hope that the spirit which the right hon. Gentleman has shown in his speech this evening will be practically illustrated in the future relations between the Government and the governed in India.

*COLONEL MILWARD (Warwickshire, Stratford-upon-Avon): I am sorry that this debate has been rather narrowed down, because there were a great many questions of general interest in the speech of the Secretary of State for India, with reference to currency, trade, military preparations, railways, and irrigation works, all of which would have been very interesting if we could have followed them up. I regret very much the *non possumus* position taken by the Chancellor of the Exchequer with regard to the Free Grant, and I think that the people of this country to-morrow morning will rub their eyes when they see that our Exchequer is so poor and the Indian Exchequer is so rich. It is perfectly true that India had a surplus for two years, but owing to the famine there will possibly be a deficit this year. On the other hand, I do not think that any nation, however rich, has ever undertaken with so light a heart as we have an expenditure this year of something like fifty millions on a distant war, and I cannot help thinking that under these circumstances we might have spared one million at all events for the relief of the famine in India. The resolution which I have placed on the Paper* differs from that of the hon. Gentleman opposite. My position is this. The Chancellor of the Exchequer states that the Government of India have made no demand on the Imperial Government. That is true, but if they had made a demand on us it would have robbed us of the grace of making a free gift, and we should not then be in a position to voluntarily give this money. But although the Government of India have not made any demand of that kind on us, Lord Curzon has reiterated over and over again that there are things which public money cannot do, and that the famine victims cannot be helped in the same way out of public funds as by private charity. You cannot administer the assistance that is required in every degree and in every case out of public money. These are the things which a free gift may accomplish, and what I want to plead for is not to assist the finances of India, not to give a million or any other sum to help the Indian Exchequer, but that we should place a million at the free disposal of the Viceroy for the purpose of supplementing the inadequate subscriptions of the people of England. I do not blame the people of England for having inadequately subscribed. The charitable and philanthropic people of this country have been drawn upon from every direction in connection with the war, and it is not only a million that was subscribed to the Mansion House War fund, but I am perfectly sure that at least five millions must have been subscribed to the

* Colonel Milward had on the Paper the following notice:—"To move, That, having regard to the widespread distress in India, and to the comparatively poor result of the appeal for subscriptions for aid in Great Britain, it is desirable to supplement these subscriptions by a free gift from the National Exchequer of one million sterling, and that this sum be placed at the unfettered discretion of the Viceroy."

various funds. Can we wonder, therefore, that the amount subscribed for the famine in India has been singularly small? In 1897 the famine subscriptions were £700,000, and in March, 1898, the date of the dissolution of the 1897 Commission, the receipts amounted to £1,190,000, besides which there were large gifts of grain and clothing also received. What is the state of the Mansion House Fund now? It only amounts to £325,000.

*LORD G. HAMILTON: The Mansion House Fund is only about £350,000, but, in addition, £170,000 has been subscribed in Scotland and Lancashire.

*COLONEL MILWARD: I did not intend to convey that the Mansion House Fund included all that had been subscribed, but, even taking that fund as it stands, it is quite £200,000 below what it was three years ago, in addition to which there were then great gifts of food and clothing, all of which are now sent to South Africa. What I venture to urge is that we might give a grant to India such as would supplement the small sum subscribed by the public in this country. The Report of the Indian Famine Commission of 1898 states—

"The testimony is unanimous and overwhelming as to the incalculable good the charitable fund has done as an auxiliary of the State system of relief and the universal gratitude it has evoked among the people. Seventy-one per cent. of the fund has been spent in giving a fresh start in life to peasant cultivators and small landowners who have been forced to eat their seed grain and part with their plough cattle, or whose plough cattle had died from want of food, or who had no agricultural resources left or no credit wherewith to procure them."

That is exactly what is taking place in India at the present moment. It is said that there would be no precedent for such a grant, but this very Parliament supplies a precedent. A year and a half ago there was a hurricane in the West Indies. At that time the Colonial Secretary addressed a letter to the Chancellor of the Exchequer in which he stated that the inhabitants of Barbados were unable to house or feed themselves. What happened? This Parliament gave a free grant of £40,000, and a loan of £50,000 without interest. Surely that was a case precisely on all fours with the present case, and surely the famine-stricken districts of India appeal to us at least as strongly as the Barbados. Then there is another reason which appeals to me very strongly, and that is the loyalty which has been shown by the people of India. I think the House ought to be reminded that on the 28th of December, the Nizam of Hyderabad offered his purse, army, and sword in the defence of Her Majesty's Empire, and also that the Maharaja of Gwalior offered a troop of horse and transport. On the 29th of December the whole of the 3rd Bengal Sikhs offered voluntarily one day's pay for the War Fund, and it therefore does seem to me that when the Nizam of Hyderabad offered his purse and his sword and the Maharaja of Gwalior offered a troop of horse, we have now an opportunity of showing our appreciation of such loyalty. I wish to associate myself with what has fallen from my hon. friend with reference to a division on this Amendment. I am not going into the lobby against the Government, because I will not be a party to squeezing the Government in order to get them to grant this money. Unless it is done freely there will be no grace in the grant at all. I hope the arguments I have addressed to the House will be considered. I believe that public feeling throughout the country is favourable to this grant. I mentioned it myself at one public meeting recently, and it was most enthusiastically received. What is a million among the many other millions spent in other directions when by it we may create a feeling of loyalty in India, and a feeling also that in the hour of her distress this country came to her assistance?

*MR. EMMOTT (Oldham): I venture to intervene in this debate not only because of the interest which I myself take in this question, but also because my constituents have such a deep interest in all that concerns the welfare of the inhabitants of our great Indian Empire. I speak, of course, to-night my own views, but I am certain I carry with me also the views of the great majority of my constituents. The interest which Lancashire has in India, whatever may be said about isolated matters in the past, is by no means a purely selfish one. In the present dire straits of the Indian people my own constituents have shown their active sympathy, and have extended generous help. Although, like other inhabitants of this country, they have subscribed liberally to

the various war funds, they have also subscribed largely to the Indian Famine Fund, and if the inhabitants of the remainder of the United Kingdom subscribed in proportion to numbers, as much as my constituents have subscribed there would be a fund of one and a half millions instead of half a million at the present time. But I am afraid, even if there were a fund of a million and a half, it would be far too little to relieve the dire necessities of India at the present moment. May I thank the noble Lord for his speech, which was able, luminous, most interesting, and above all intensely sympathetic? Lord Curzon on one occasion made an offer to pay the fare of any rich man to the famine districts in order that he might see for himself the sufferings of the people, and agreed to take a chance of a subscription on his return. I cannot help feeling with my hon. friend that the people of this country hardly realise the extent of this calamity. This famine affects ninety millions of people, or between a third and a half of the whole population of India. At the present moment there is a population larger than that of this great city dependent from day to day on the relief which the Government can give. Large tracts of country have become desert; there has been an immense destruction of cattle—in some districts as much as 90 per cent.—and comparatively well-to-do people have lost their all, and have been driven from their homes. I am therefore afraid that there must be a greater slowness of recovery than after previous famines. Added to all the misery and disease which accompany famine, there has been a great outbreak of cholera. Just about the time that we were mad with joy over the relief of Mafeking—and I think we did perfectly right to rejoice about it—what was happening in India? An English doctor arrived at one of these cholera camps, and he found 400 people dead, other people scattered about dying on the ground, others struggling in the water, where they had gone to drink, and had been seized whilst drinking, and everyone who could had run away. Could a worse inferno than that be imagined? There were many other places where similar scenes occurred, and I think that we should all remember it to the credit of India that all the misery and destitution of famine and all the agony caused by disease were borne with that silent dignity and uncomplaining patience, so characteristic of those docile races whom it is our pride and privilege to rule in India. Such grief and pain borne silently is not, however, less pathetic than a sorrow which cries aloud in the bazaars and proclaims itself at every street corner. I do not wish in the least, however, that we should be governed by emotion in this matter. The loss of life from this famine may be less than usual, but the exhaustion that will follow it will be very much greater. The number of cattle that have died is simply enormous, and the low condition of the people seems to be so great that many will be unable to do any work for a long time. Lord Curzon, seeing what would occur, appealed first of all *urbi* to the Lord Mayor, and then practically *orbi* to the world at large, and among those who responded was the Sultan of Turkey. I almost wish he had kept his money for another object, and that he had saved us the necessity of accepting it. The total response to Lord Curzon's appeal was, however, miserably inadequate, and my own impression is that money must be found somewhere, or very serious permanent injury to India will be the result. There are only two methods of obtaining money, one by a loan in India and the other by gift from England. Large loans have already been made in India on the security of impoverished landowners. Most, if not all, of this money has to be paid back, and I fear the tax collector will appear only too soon after the famine. I think, therefore, that loans in India cannot extend much farther than they have done, and I think it is a case of a gift from England. It is said that would be against precedent, and I do not in the least decry precedent. In a matter of this kind it is easy to relieve our consciences by generosity, and do permanent harm unless we give wisely. But the famine is unprecedented. It is an act of God, not the product of man's carelessness, and any precedent could only affect a future famine of equal proportions. Again, it is the second famine in three years. I further think that the Indian race is not a race with the instincts of paupers. There are other reasons of great cogency which might be urged. In the first place, it is desirable, even from the point of view of our trade relations, that as soon as possible India should return to a normal condition, but I attach more importance almost to the effect this

gift will have on the people of India. A new era is now opening up in the Far East, and it is surely worth our while to try and bind India to us by the chains of affection. But my main argument is a financial one. India is already doing so much to relieve famine that I do not think she can be expected to do any more. She has been paying Rx.1,000,000 or Rx.1,500,000 per annum for many years for famine insurance, but in addition to that there are the import duties which were put on in 1894. They are practically a famine tax. They were put on because of the fall in the rupee, and were kept on because of war and famine, and I imagine, having regard to the noble Lord's past action, they would have been taken off had not this famine occurred. These amount to Rx. 3,500,000. Therefore India is already paying Rx.5,000,000 for famine at the present time. I will not refer to the Report of Lord Welby's Commission, except to say that it recommends that we should treat India generously, and that a considerable sum is due for past overcharges. I congratulate the noble Lord on the success of his currency policy. I do not want to say one word against that policy, because whatever one's opinion may have been regarding it at first it is now an accomplished fact, and no one would desire to disturb it. But there is a reverse side to it. The rupee was raised from 1s. 1d. to 1s. 4d. between 1895 and now, and that has had the same effect as a contraction of currency. It helped the Government, but I do not think it helped the traders or the agriculturists. We are hearing again from India the same pitiable tale of these silver ornaments being sold at even less than their melting value. This is an extract from the *Civil and Military Gazette* of Lahore—

"The fact that the Government of India have bought seventy-two lakhs worth of silver more than their programme contemplated means nothing. The fact that the silver comes from Gwalior means much. It means that the people of Gwalior have unearthed their long-buried hoards of silver ornaments and sold them to the bunnias, who have sold them to the Gwalior authorities, who have melted them down and sold the bullion to the British Government. We may expect to hear of other native States in the famine area following in the steps of Gwalior."

I have here a private letter showing that these silver ornaments are being bought for 5 to 8 annas per tola instead of the 10 annas they are worth. Here we have poor and middle-class people being cheated again, and not even getting the full value of the silver for melting purposes. Even if they had got full value they would have obtained only about 60 per cent. of what could be obtained seven years ago. I have tried to give some reasons why we should help India at the present time. I do not know whether my hon. friends will go to a division, but all I can say is that if they do I will vote with them with the greatest pleasure. I am a new Member of this House, and whether my stay be long or short in it I feel sure I shall never give a vote which I believe to be not only in the interests of India, but also, when rightly understood, in the interests of this country, with greater certainty than I shall vote on this occasion.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): No one can have heard the concluding words of the hon. Member's speech without feeling that at all events they came from the heart. The hon. Member stated he was going to vote for the Amendment on grounds which appealed to him as an Englishmen and a citizen of the empire of which India is a part. I believe the hon. Member is absolutely sincere; but, if he will forgive me for saying so, I think he is absolutely wrong; and if he considers this matter in a thoroughly impartial spirit he will come to the conclusion, I think, to which I at all events have been driven—that not only the interests of India, but the interests of England and of sound finance throughout the Empire are really involved in the House coming to a sober and rational decision on the issue presented to-night. But there is one smaller matter on which I must first touch almost parenthetically. My hon. friend the Member for Cardiff in the speech he delivered made an attack on one of the great princes of India—a gratuitous and wholly unmerited attack. The Maharaja of Gwalior has made a most generous offer of assistance in connection with the trouble which we have to face with all the rest of the world in China. I should have thought that that offer would provoke the gratitude and thanks of every man in the House and of every citizen in the Empire. But that is not the way the matter has presented itself to my hon. friend. He says—"Why did not the Government

compel the Maharaja to devote the money which he has offered so generously and patriotically to the alleviation of the sufferings of his own countrymen?" My hon. friend spoke hastily and without adequate knowledge of the fact. This prince is still young; but he has had time to show himself one of the most energetic, public-spirited, and patriotic Princes reigning under our suzerainty in India. He has not confined his efforts, as my hon. friend thinks, to extraneous charity or outside the boundary of our Indian possessions. His own subjects, some of whom have been touched by the famine, have received from him the most generous assistance; and, not content with dealing with the subjects within the limits of his own province, he has gone to the assistance of other and poorer Princes in India. And, after all, for whom is this hospital intended? It is in the main intended for that Indian contingent which has gone from India to China to fight the battles of the Empire, and I cannot imagine a cause which would more naturally and more properly appeal to the generous instincts of an Indian prince than that cause to which this prince has so nobly and generously subscribed. I said I would treat this matter parenthetically, but I could not leave it untouched because it involved a personal and most unmerited attack upon a prince who is an example to all who have similar great responsibilities cast upon them within the limits of our Empire. Everyone must feel that the Amendment of the hon. Member for Dumfries has been prompted by generous sentiments which have nothing in them of self-interest, but which are dictated purely by a feeling of sympathy with India in the appalling and almost unprecedented calamity now affecting that country. But in this House we have to ask ourselves not whether the sentiments which prompt a particular resolution are generous and praiseworthy or not, but whether its results are likely to be beneficial not merely to the relatively narrow interests of the United Kingdom, but to the larger interests of which the United Kingdom is the principal guardian. I venture to submit that the arguments my noble friend urged in his admirable speech, reinforced as they have been by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, have not been replied to. The Amendment is avowedly an attempt to substitute Parliamentary charity, extracted *pro rata* from the pockets of the taxpayers, for the spontaneous gifts of those anxious to relieve distress in India or any other part of the world. No doubt there are occasions when a Vote of the House may rightly be invoked in favour of a cause for which charity has been invoked. But the inevitable result of the House accepting the Amendment can only be that never again will any appeal of this kind be responded to by the public. It will be felt that Parliament itself has declared solemnly that it is a matter for the taxpayer and not for charity. Charity will be dried up at its source, and in every case in which hitherto charity has been invoked you will have gentlemen coming to this House and saying, "You have set a precedent which should be followed. This is not a case in which private benevolence should be appealed to. The proper course is to propose a Vote in Committee of Supply, or ask for a loan from the investing public." That is a precedent which, if set at all, should only be set with the utmost caution and in cases of the extremest necessity. Is this a case of the extremest necessity? It would be if the refusal of the House to accept the Amendment were likely to produce any additional loss of life from this famine. But my noble friend has told us repeatedly that if India should be unable to meet the necessities of the case she has behind her the British Exchequer. It is not pretended that the finances of India are in such a condition that she is unable, so far as the preservation of life is concerned in the afflicted districts, to deal with such a crisis of unprecedented magnitude as that with which she has to contend. Under these circumstances any charitable donation made by the House at the expense of the British taxpayer—for that is the proposition—would be made to India without India requiring it, without India pretending she required it, and in advance of any necessity. If indeed the Government were to tell the House that our interests are so alien from the interests of India that we regard India as a possession from which we mainly derive indirect profit and direct glory, but to which we feel ourselves so little responsible that we are not willing to come to her assistance, then hon. Gentlemen would be justified in saying that the British Empire was indeed unworthy of our great Indian possession.

We put forward no such proposal. All we say is that sound principle requires that the financial responsibility of the different parts of the Empire should be kept separate, and it is only when the financial resources of any particular part of the Empire absolutely fail that it is legitimate to call upon the rest of the Empire for assistance. My hon. friend behind me, who spoke last but one, quoted the precedent of the West Indies. He said that in 1891, and again last year, or the year before, a sum was voted by this House to meet the calamity which had desolated the Leeward Islands. But the precedent quoted by my hon. friend is in favour of the Government, and not against it. For the precedent is this—that it was only when a dependency of the Crown was practically in financial extremeties, when it had not at its command the resources which would enable it to meet the strokes of evil fortune by which it was overwhelmed, that this Parliament and people came to its assistance. If ever India is in the condition of the Leeward Islands, this country will come to the assistance of India as it came to the assistance of the West Indies. I would venture to suggest that even the action we took in the case of those islands, used as it has been by my hon. friend, shows how careful we should be in starting new precedents of this character. The late Secretary of State for India, who made so excellent a speech, I remember, two years ago divided the House in favour of a grant to India to meet a famine which was then raging in another portion of that Empire, although at that moment she had a large surplus at her disposal. Now, supposing the right hon. Gentleman had succeeded in his endeavour on that occasion to induce the House to subscribe a large sum for that famine, followed as that case would have been by the present famine, would it not be clear that an Indian famine meant a Vote of this House towards Indian needs as regularly as in the past an Irish famine has meant an appeal to this House for Irish needs? Is that a precedent which this House would readily set? Do they desire so to mix up the Indian and British Exchequers as to make it a matter of course that whenever a famine exists in India, even though Indian finance may be in the highest state of prosperity, that is a just cause for coming to this country for financial assistance? That would be, as has been pointed out by my noble friend, the most certain method of introducing disorder into Indian finance. I am one of those who believe, and, indeed, it will be accepted as a commonplace, that the most fruitful parent of social troubles is financial irregularity and extravagance, and that the country which is reckless of its resources is a country which is rapidly approaching the greatest social and political difficulties. [Opposition cheers.] That appears to be a commonplace accepted by both sides of the House. Can that danger be more certainly produced in India than by that kind of charity which has met with so much favour on both sides of the House to-night? Can you conceive of a temptation which it would be more impossible for any Indian financier to resist than the temptation of appealing to a House, for whose action he was not responsible, to taxpayers whose interests it was not his business to guard, for resources which would enable him to meet difficulties occurring many thousands of miles away? My noble friend certainly did not go beyond the truth when he said that to come forward to Indian assistance when India is not in financial straits would be to infuse into the veins of the Indian financial system a principle of corruption from which it would never recover. I hope the House will never consent to that proceeding. I am reluctant, and I do not mean, to put the matter on selfish grounds. I do not mean to base the main stress of my argument upon the position of the British taxpayer or the burden thrown upon him, but I must say I listened with some surprise to an observation that fell from an hon. friend behind me. The hon. Member for Stratford-on-Avon said that when we were spending forty or fifty millions upon the South African war, could not we spare one million for the Indian famine? [Opposition cheers.] Apparently the argument of my hon. friend meets with approval on the other side. Let us translate it into simpler language. So translated it comes to this—that the heavier the burdens and the greater the expenditure which Imperial necessities throw upon the British taxpayer, so much more ought the subscriptions of the British taxpayer to be for the financial needs of other parts of the Empire. Surely

that is a financial paradox which can hardly be accepted by the sober reflection of the House. Let it be remembered that this Empire of ours is at present run on a system never tried in the world before. The Empire is one of unprecedented extent in mere area, and portions of it are to be found in every quarter of the globe. It is all paid for, as an Empire, by these islands.

MR. MACLEAN: India pays its own way.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Gentleman is quite right. India pays her fair share.

MR. JOSEPH WALTON: I beg pardon; India pays more than its own share, according to Lord Welby's Report.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Gentleman is probably not aware that as soon as Lord Welby's Report was made public the Government announced their intention of paying their quota. I may therefore assume that, according to Lord Welby's Report, the balance of payment between these islands and India is equitable. But the Empire as a whole is run by these islands, and if you are going, in addition to that responsibility, to say that whenever a calamity occurs in any part of that Empire the responsibility is also to fall upon the taxpayer of these islands, I say you are rushing into financial responsibilities of which you may have in a very few years great reason to repent. I am one of those who watch with considerable alarm the growth of expenditure we have to view already. But if to that expenditure, great and growing, and, I fear, likely to grow as it is, you are going to add these additional burdens, then, indeed, even the wealth, the enterprise, and the patriotism of this country may feel itself at last overburdened. I feel most strongly that the resolution which the House has got to take to-night is one of the deepest import for the future of the Empire. What we ask the House to affirm is that the financial responsibility for the various portions of the Empire rests primarily upon those portions of the Empire, and that in particular the financial responsibilities of India are Indian responsibilities and not British responsibilities. We admit, and I would take leave to ask the House to affirm, that in cases where Indian resources are not equal to Indian needs this House may well be asked to come to its assistance. But at the same time we also ask the House to affirm that, until these needs do become greater than Indian resources can bear, it is not only not true charity, it is not only not sound policy, but it is absolutely suicidal for us to endeavour—in a mood of sentiment with which everybody must sympathise, in response to motives which everybody must feel, to relieve sufferings that go to the heart of every feeling man—to prematurely and unnecessarily burden the already heavily-burdened finances of this country.

*MR. SAMUEL SMITH (Flintshire): I ask the permission of the House to read an extract from a letter which I have received from India this evening. My correspondent writes from Poonah, under date 6th July, and his letter indicates that the extremest point of necessity has at last arisen. He says—

"It is with a heavy heart, with no little sense of responsibility, that I now sit to write to you; and I beg your thoughtful and very prayerful consideration of what I am about to say. The month of June—the first month of the monsoon, and in some respects the most important—has come and gone. The result, as far as the rainfall is concerned, tabulated from the official returns, is shown in the *Deccan Herald*, dated 3rd inst. Briefly stated it is this: In the famine affected areas the rainfall has been defective from 71 to 91 per cent.—that is, in regions of the severest distress where 100 inches would have barely brought alleviation, only nine inches had fallen! But this is not the most appalling feature, for assuming a late rainy season, the monsoons with their refreshing freight might be yet looked for; but the affected regions have 'been outside the influence of both monsoon currents.' In other words, both the N.E. and S.W. monsoons have come, and spread feebly, but without bringing the longed-for refreshing and fertilisation to the death-stricken regions. This means—no relief for the present, and hardly any hope for the future. The ominous forecast of this prolonged drought is summed up in the *Vanguard* of 30th June. 'This famine is, perhaps, the most fearful calamity that has ever visited this earth. The worst is to come. The most reasonable estimates are that from 18,000,000 to 20,000,000 will perish in this dearth now spreading over the whole peninsula. Nothing of the kind has appealed to the hearts of Christian people as the death-cry of these starving millions.'"

If this is not a case of extreme necessity I do not know what is.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It is not financial necessity.

*Mr. SAMUEL SMITH: It is a financial necessity, because it is quite beyond the power of India to feed the twenty millions of people who are famine-stricken. India is an extremely poor country. The great majority of the Members of the House have no conception of the poverty of that country. The taxation of India is very heavy upon the very poor people, and it is entirely beyond the power of India to cope with this famine. Personally I shall heartily vote with my hon. friend.

*Mr. MADDISON (Sheffield, Brightside): It is not my intention to stand long between the House and the division; but I think there need be no apology for any Member of this House at ten minutes to twelve o'clock to rise and express his opinion about the questions which have been discussed all night. I merely wish to say that while we appreciate to the full the kindly spirit which the noble Lord the Secretary for India and the First Lord of the Treasury have displayed —and I am quite sure they are sincere in deploring the terrible calamity to India— I submit that this sympathy does not go far enough. I would humbly tell the First Lord of the Treasury that, in spite of the great cost of the war in South Africa, to which we object, you could not go to a centre of the working class population in any part of England where you would not get unanimous approval of a free grant to the Indian Government for the purposes of famine relief—a grant of five millions, aye, of ten millions, if that sum is needed. I was rather surprised at the peculiar way in which the First Lord of the Treasury dealt with the hon. Member for Stratford-on-Avon, who thought, rightly, that if we could spend fifty or sixty millions on the war in South Africa, we ought to spare a million or two for the relief of India. The right hon. Gentleman says that that was a policy of the greater the burden in one direction the more extended should the appeal to the British taxpayer be in another. The hon. Member for Exeter gave us some very wise advice, and told us what was healthy and what unhealthy finance. He is a great authority, doubtless, but I wish that he would apply his finance theories in this country as well as to other countries. He has shown no great objection to grants-in-aid here and grants-in-aid there in England and Ireland. But when he told us of the probable bankruptcy of the British Empire he had to admit that the country for which we ask this grant-in-aid is the one part of the Empire which costs us nothing. We are told in solemn tones that a grant of five millions from this House would rob the people of India of their proper dignity and self-respect. But what dignity and self-respect could these terrible crowds of famished people have? All the argument about sound finance and self-respect was absurd when applied to 300 millions of people who had no more control over their own government than they have over the inhabitants of France. I think that British rule has been on the whole good for the Indian people; but does anybody in this House believe that we hold India for the benefit of the Indian people? No, we hold it for Imperial purposes. I do submit that we would be acting consistently with the highest and soundest finance—that we would be not only giving vent to a healthy sentiment but exercising sound justice in making this grant, and on these grounds I support the motion. I was surprised that the hon. Member for Bethnal Green had been disappointed at the result of his application to the Archbishops, who have referred him to the Mansion House Fund. Nothing could have been more reasonable than such an answer as that coming from such a quarter! I regard this help to India as part of our Imperial obligations, and those who vote against the motion will be the true Little Englanders.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 112; Noes, 65. (Division List No. 244.)

AYES.

Allhusen, Augustus Henry E.	Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol	Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)
Arrol, Sir William	Bentinck, Lord Henry C.	Cecil, Evelyn (Hertford, East)
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John	Blundell, Colonel Henry	Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Balcarres, Lord	Brassey, Albert	Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.)
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)	Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John	Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (Leeds)	Bullard, Sir Harry	Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Banbury, Frederick George	Butcher, John George	Coghill, Douglas Harry
Bartley, George C. T.	Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.	Cohen, Benjamin Louis

Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir J. Charles Ready
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cornwallis, Fiennes Stanley W.
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Curzon, Viscount
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Faber, George Denison
Furgusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Field, Admiral (Eastbourne)
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Gedge, Sydney
Gibbons, J. Lloyd
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Rt Hn G. J (St George's
Goschen, George J. (Sussex)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Green, Walford D (Wednesbury
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Hamilton, Rt. Hn. Lord George
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Henderson, Alexander
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Knowles, Lees
Lafone, Alfred
Lawrence, Sir E. Durning (Corn
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks.)
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Lowles, John
Macartney, W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
Maclure, Sir John William
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James
Malcolm, Ian
Maxwell, Rt. Hon. Sir Herb. E.
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Middlemore, Jn. Throgmorton
More, Robt. Jasp. (Shropshire)
Morgan, Hon. F. (Monm'hsh.)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute
Murray, Chas. J. (Coventry)
Percy, Earl
Phillpotts, Captain Arthur
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plunkett, Rt. Hon. H. Curzon
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Purvis, Robert
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Rentoul, James Alexander
Richardson, Sir T. (Hartlep'l)
Ridley, Rt. Hn. Sir Matthew W.
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. T.
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Russell, T. W. (Tyrone)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Abel H. (Christchurch)
Smith, Jas. Parker (Lanarks)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E (Kent)
Welby, Lt.-Col A. C. E. (Taunt.
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, George
Wyvill, Marmaduke D'Arcy

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Sir William Walrond and
Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Asquith, Rt Hn. Herbert Henry
Austin, M. (Limerick, W.)
Bainbridge, Emerson
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Billson, Alfred
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Clark, Dr. G. B.
Crilly, Daniel
Dalziel, James Henry
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Duckworth, James
Emmott, Alfred
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flynn, James Christopher
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gourley, Sir Edward Temperley
Gurdon, Sir William Brampton
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
Healy, Maurice (Cork)
Healy, Timothy M. (N. Louth)
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jones, William (Carn'rvonshire
Lambert, George
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cumb'land
Lough, Thomas
Macaleese, Daniel
MacDonnell, Dr MA (Queen'sC
Maclean, James Mackenzie
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
M'Leod, John
Maddison, Fred.
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Pease, Joseph A. (Northumb.
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Power, Patrick Joseph
Provand, Andrew Dryburgh
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Samuel, J. (Stockton-on-Tees)
Seeley, Charles Hilton
Shaw, Chas. Edward (Stafford)
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Souttar, Robinson
Steadman, William Charles
Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)
Thomas, D. A. (Merthyr)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wedderburn, Sir William
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, John Carvell (Notts.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Woods, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Herbert Gladstone and
Mr. M'Arthur.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That it appears, by the Accounts laid before this House, that the total revenue of India for the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1899, was £67,595,815; that the total expenditure in India and in England charged against revenue was £64,954,942; that there was a surplus of revenue over expenditure of £2,640,873; and that the capital outlay on railways and irrigation works not charged against revenue was £3,279,316. — (*Secretary Lord George Hamilton.*)

Resolution to be reported.

INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION (IRELAND) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 1 :—

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. G. W. BALFOUR, Leeds, Central) said that the Amendment he now proposed to move was to be taken in connection with one which appeared a little lower down in the Paper, and was moved in accordance with the pledge he gave approving the recommendations of the Committee.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 7, to leave out 'portion of.'"—(*Mr. G. W. Balfour.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 11, to leave out from 'them' to the second 'in,' in line 12."—(*Mr. G. W. Balfour.*)

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.) said that this was an attempt to prevent by statute the teaching of the Irish language. He had never known of a case in which an Amendment of this kind had been moved, except in the case of the Pigott Commission. Where was the necessity for the Amendment unless it were to limit and restrict the action of the Commission?

Amendment agreed to.

MR. T. M. HEALY said he was afraid that the form of the rules would exclude the schools of the Christian Brothers from the benefits of the Act, and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would accept the Amendment he now proposed.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 14, at end, to insert, 'Nothing in any rule made in pursuance of this section shall exclude from participation in the benefits of the said Acts any school which would be entitled to participate in such benefits if this Act had not passed.'"—(*Mr. T. M. Healy.*)

MR. G. W. BALFOUR said if the Amendment were accepted the difficulty which the hon. Member believed to exist as to want of a definition of the word "school" would remain. He could assure the hon. Member that the Government did not wish to exclude the schools of the Christian Brothers from the benefits of the Act.

MR. T. M. HEALY said that if he withdrew the Amendment he would like to have a definite assurance from the right hon. Gentleman that this was an improper use to make of the Act. He thought if the Rules were laid on the Table it would be an effective preservation, and therefore he begged to withdraw this Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause 1, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 2 agreed to.

Clause 3:—

MR. T. M. HEALY said when the original Act was introduced, considerable sums were granted in different parts of Ireland for prizes, but from year to year those sums had been diminished until now, instead of a boy winning a £40 scholarship as a first prize, the amount had fallen so low as to be only some £25. It was said that that was owing to the fund having become bankrupt, but Irish Members found that it could still be drawn upon for other purposes. There was now an attempt to pay pensions to those who had been responsible for education under the Intermediate Education Act of thirty years ago. They were no doubt deserving persons, but if they were deserving of pensions they should be pensioned out of the English funds and not the Irish. It had always been laid down that a pension was deferred pay, and if that were so he did not see how persons who had never entered into a contract with the State could be entitled to a pension. They were not Civil Servants, and they should not be pensioned out of the Irish Church Fund. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, lines 1 and 2, to leave out the words 'out of the funds placed at their disposal grant,' and insert the words 'recommend grants of,' instead thereof."—(*Mr. T. M. Healy.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

MR. G. W. BALFOUR justified giving a permissive power to the Board to grant pensions to its officers, stating that a re-

commendation in this sense was made by the Commissioners some years ago, and the proposal was in the interests of education itself. It was very desirable that these offices should be pensionable, and therefore he hoped the hon. Gentleman would not press his Amendment.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.) hoped the hon. Member would go to a division. He looked upon this clause as an excrescence on the Bill. The officials were paid £800 a year for doing work which was neither continuous nor laborious, and they ought to insure their lives on the endowment policy system. He really objected to this species of foster-father philanthropy towards these poor afflicted officials! It seemed to him that it was impossible to bring in a single Bill dealing with any phase of Irish life—social, educational, literary, or what not—without it being burdened with superannuation clauses or clauses creating or preserving vested interests. If the right hon. Gentleman was determined to create vested interests, he should not rob the Irish Church Fund to do it; he should go to the British Treasury. The Report of the Commission never contemplated such retiring allowances; and he trusted that the right hon. Gentleman would either accept the Amendment of the hon. Member for North Louth or excise the clause altogether from the Bill.

MR. T. M. HEALY said that this clause had nothing whatever to do with the rest of the Bill, which was intended to improve the educational system of Ireland. There never had been any agitation in favour of these pensions, and they never had been suggested in any public minute, so far as he knew. There was, he maintained, a very strong feeling in regard to engrafting on an Education Bill a system of pensions to public servants whose general action had been of no value, whose names were not known, and whose deeds were not notorious. He did not think the people of Ireland would be much the better off after this Act was passed than before it. It was not going to create a new heaven and a new earth in Ireland. He had no doubt these gentlemen were all most excellent Tories, but was that a reason for granting them superannuation pensions? When dealing with the Dublin Corporation Bill, which sought powers to grant certain superannuation allowances, some gentleman connected with Ireland exclaimed "that is a job;" but when pensions were to be given to some gentlemen connected with some particular Tory Department, these same oracles cried, "Oh, they deserve it!" If these excellent and most admirable Tories must be pensioned, let it be done by the British Government, and not out of this miserable Irish Church Fund.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR said that so far as he was concerned he knew nothing of these gentlemen personally, and he knew nothing about their religion or their politics. The proposal was made, not in the interests of any individual, but in the interests of education itself. It was not desirable that they should have gentlemen in the position of assistant-commissioners filling a non-pensionable office under the ordinary Civil Service rules at a certain age. The Government had introduced this provision at the very earnest request of the Commissioners themselves, and it was in the interest of the service that it was submitted.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Why not put it on an English fund?

MR. G. W. BALFOUR said that at the present time these salaries were paid, not out of an English fund, but out of the income of the Intermediate Education Board, and a large part of that income was derived from taxation. These persons were appointed on the distinct understanding that their office was pensionable, and it was practically impossible to get rid of any of these officials except they were pensioned.

MR. T. M. HEALY asserted that if they were civil servants they would have to pass competitive examinations in order to secure their appointments, but they had not done so. They were appointed through favouritism, and got their appointments through the nomination of their particular friends in the Tory party. They were appointed because they had obtained the ear and favour of the ruling class in Ireland, and now at the end of their time it was said that these gentlemen who obtained their offices through pure favouritism were to be pensioned because they were

civil servants. They had no claim to a pension. Yet Ireland had to provide for them. It was typical of the way in which Ireland was treated. This was the penalty Ireland had to pay for a new system of education. They had to pension a number of superannuated frauds to the extent of £4,000 a year, because they wished to give their children technical education.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 73; Noes, 17. (Division List No. 245.)

AYES.

Allhusen, Augustus H. Eden	Fisher, William Hayes	Phillpotts, Captain Arthur
Arrol, Sir William	Gibbons, J. Lloyd	Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John	Goschen, Rt Rn GJ (St George's)	Plunkett, Rt. Hon. H. C.
Balcarres, Lord	Goschen, George J. (Sussex)	Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)	Green, Walford D. (Wednesb'y	Purvis, Robert
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (Leeds)	Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robert W.	Rentoul, James Alexander
Banbury, Frederick George	Haslett, Sir James Horner	Richardson, Sir Thos. (Hartlep'l
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol	Hornby, Sir William Henry	Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. T.
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John	Knowles, Lees	Robertson, Herbert (Hackney
Bullard, Sir Harry	Lawrence, Sir E. Durning-(Corn	Russell, T. W. (Tyrone)
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire	Lawrence, W. F. (Liverpool)	Seely, Charles Hilton
Cecil, Evelyn (Hertford, E.)	Lawson, John Grant (Yorks.)	Simeon, Sir Barrington
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)	Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie	Smith, Abel H. (Christchurch)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm)	Macartney, W. G. Ellison	Smith, James P. (Lanarksh.)
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r	Macdona, John Cumming	Talbot, Rt. Hn J. G (Oxf'd Univ.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry	Maclure, Sir John William	Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse	M'Killop, James	Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E. (Kent)
Colomb, Sir J. Charles Ready	Malcolm, Ian	Welby, Lt-Col. A. C. E (Taunton
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow	Melville, Beresford Valentine	Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Cornwallis, Fiennes Stanley W.	Middlemore, Jn. Throgmorton	Wylie, Alexander
Curzon, Viscount	Milward, Colonel Victor	Wyvill, Marmaduke D'Arcy
Dalrymple, Sir Charles	More, Robert J. (Shropshire)	
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-	Morgan, Hn. F. (Monmouthsh.)	TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Faber, George Denison	Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute	Sir William Walrond and
Finch, George H.	Murray, Charles J. (Coventry	Mr. Anstruther.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne	Penn, John	

NOES.

Caldwell, James	Healy, Maurice (Cork)	O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Channing, Francis Allston	Healy, T. M. (N. Louth)	Pease, Joseph A. (Northumb.)
Crilly, Daniel	Jones, W. (Carnarvonshire)	Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)
Doogan, P. C.	Lambert, George	
Flynn, James Christopher	Lawson, Sir W. (Cumb'land)	TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Goddard, Daniel Ford	Macaleese, Daniel	Captain Donelan and Mr.
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-	Macdonnell, Dr M A (Queen's C	Patrick O'Brien.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I do not propose to move the next Amendment, but I would ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he will incorporate into this clause the words of the preceding clause, and the words "with the approval of the Treasury."

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: Yes.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 6, after the word 'grant,' to insert the words 'with the approval of the Treasury.'"—(*Mr. T. M. Healy.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Mr. T. M. Healy.

MR. T. M. HEALY said that they had now come to the last Amendment on the Paper, and he hoped the Government would not in any way derogate from the undertaking they had given, but would accept it at once. It was a very reasonable Amendment.

New clause:—

"The Board under this Act shall, in addition to the members already appointed, consist of five additional members, who shall be nominated by the Lord Lieutenant."—(*Mr. T. M. Healy.*)

brought up and read the first and second time, and added.

Bill reported, as amended; to be considered upon Monday next.

NAVAL RESERVE BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid) said that by the Act of 1859 Parliament specifically stated the number of men to be engaged in the Naval Reserve at 30,000. He believed that up to this time we had not got that number. But this Bill authorised the raising of an indefinite number of men—anything from 15,000 to 50,000 men.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. GOSCHEN, St. George's, Hanover Square) said that the number of Volunteers of the second class was fixed at 15,000. The other class included pensioners who were in future liable to be called out for a certain number of days drill in the year, but they could not say what that number of pensioners would be.

MR. CALDWELL said he quite admitted that. Under the Royal Navy Act of 1859 they authorised the raising of 30,000. Under this Bill they authorised 15,000 men, and in addition they were going to call out the old pensioners on stated occasions. But what about the artificers? The point, however, to which he wished to direct the attention of the Committee was that by the Bill they were authorising the Admiralty to raise an indefinite number of men without the authority of Parliament. In that they were departing from the ordinary constitutional rule that Parliament should have the control of the men engaged or enlisted as soldiers or sailors whether in the Regular Army and Navy or in the Reserve. It was a new departure, and whether it was right or wrong, it was a departure that it was hardly right to expect the Committee to discuss at 1.30 in the morning. Every man who was in receipt of a pension was liable to be called out in times of emergency, so that the principle was already in force; but in future the pensioner would have to drill during the year, which made all the difference. He desired to move to leave out Sub-section 3, in order to elicit some explanation from the right hon. Gentleman. That sub-section made one important change by making the term of service under the Naval Reserve Act five years and no longer. At the end of that time the men were entitled to their discharge, subject to their being engaged in active service.

*THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. MACARTNEY, Antrim, S.) pointed out that the enlistment was for five years, at the end of which period a man could take his discharge, or could re-enlist for a further five years and continue to do so until he had reached the age of fifty-five. The Reserve was an entirely different one to that which existed under the Act of 1859.

MR. CALDWELL called the attention of the hon. Gentleman to the fact that he had lost sight of the fact that it was plainly stated in the Bill that Section 2 of the 1859 Act should not apply to this. It was plain to him that the Government had brought in this Bill having evidently no knowledge of its contents, and no one could tell what the result of it would be.

*SIR J. COLOMB (Great Yarmouth) thought it was desirable that the House should know what was meant, because it did appear that all the Government was doing was to repeal the Act which would have limited the enlistment for five years. It made a great difference with regard to the efficiency of the Reserve. How was a man to escape from it? Did his service extend until there was a vacancy in Greenwich Hospital for him?

*MR. MACARTNEY said that after the Bill became law there would be an option given to the men, either to take their discharge or to volunteer for another five years service. At the end of each five years they would be entitled to their discharge, or they could re-enlist. In some cases the enlistment would not be five years, because if a man's time expired when he was fifty-two he would not be eligible to serve for more than another three years.

*SIR J. COLOMB understood that the repeal of Sub-section 2 only referred to marine pensioners.

MR. CALDWELL saw nothing in the Act with respect to five years, and so far as the present Bill was concerned the measure which exempted men from the five years clause—Section 2 of the Royal Naval Reserve Volunteer Act—did not apply to money received under this Act. It appeared to him that a very great change was about to be made. He desired to raise another point under Sub-section 4, the meaning of which was that the men in certain cases would be treated under the Milltary Services Act, and not under the Act of 1859. In this case another very great change was being made in the existing system by this Bill, and no explanation had been given for that change, nor was the matter limited to service on shore.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs) said if the men were at sea they would come under the Military Service Act, and if on shore, under the Army Act.

Bill reported without amendment; to be read the third time upon Monday next.

COUNTY COURTS (IRELAND) BILL [Lords].

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged, Bill withdrawn.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS' SUPERANNUATION (ISLE OF MAN) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

MR. CALDWELL asked whether teachers in the Isle of Man who had got a certificate from the Department were teachers in Great Britain, or were they under a different system? Again, were the services of the teachers in the Isle of Man to be regarded as part of the services for pension?

*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. JESSE COLLINGS, Birmingham, Bordesley) said that in the Isle of Man the Education Code was adopted, and the teachers were certificated by the Department in the same way as in England; but they had none of the privileges of the Act of 1898. The object of the present Bill was to provide that the service in whole or in part in the Isle of Man should be recorded as service on which superannuation was based. The Bill was necessary because the education authorities in the Isle of Man had great difficulty in getting good teachers, because their services in the island were not recorded for superannuation purposes. The Bill had been framed by arrangement with the Treasury.

MR. T. M. HEALY: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he means to abolish the Parliaments of the Isle of Man and Jersey?

[No reply was given.]

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed for Monday next.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS' SUPERANNUATION (JERSEY) BILL.

Read a second time, and committed for Monday next.

POOR RELIEF (IRELAND) BILL.

Read a second time, and committed for Monday next.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) BILL.

Read a second time, and committed for Monday next.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) (No. 2) BILL.

Read a second time, and committed for Monday next.

In pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th day of this instant July, Mr. Speaker adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at five minutes before Two of the clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Friday, 27th July, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

GLYNCORRWG URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL GAS BILL [H.L.].

Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to.

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL (GENERAL POWERS) BILL.

The Queen's consent signified; and Bill reported with Amendments.

MID-KENT WATER BILL.

Reported with Amendments.

CHRISTCHURCH AND BOURNEMOUTH TRAMWAYS BILL.

Reported with Amendments.

METROPOLITAN DISTRICT RAILWAY BILL.

Reported from the Select Committee with Amendments.

PLYMOUTH, STONEHOUSE, AND DEVONPORT TRAMWAYS BILL.

Reported with Amendments.

SAINT DAVID'S RAILWAY (ABANDONMENT) BILL.

Reported without amendment.

BRAY AND ENNISKERRY RAILWAY BILL.

Reported with Amendments.

LANCASHIRE ELECTRIC POWER BILL.

Reported from the Select Committee with Amendments.

SOUTH WALES ELECTRICAL POWER DISTRIBUTION BILL.

Reported from the Select Committee with Amendments.

LONDON, WALTHAMSTOW, AND EPPING FOREST RAILWAY (ABANDONMENT) BILL.

Moved, That the Order made on the 12th day of March last, "That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after Tuesday, the 26th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2ª; agreed to, and Bill read 2ª accordingly.

LIVERPOOL CORPORATION BILL.

Read 3ª, with the Amendments; a further Amendment made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.

EXETER CORPORATION BILL.

ABERDEEN POLICE AND IMPROVEMENT BILL.

Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

WANDSWORTH AND PUTNEY GAS BILL.

Read 3ª, with the Amendments; further Amendments made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.

WEST HAM CORPORATION BILL.

Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

RICKMANSWORTH AND UXBRIDGE VALLEY WATER BILL.

Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

GREAT SOUTHERN AND WESTERN AND WATERFORD, LIMERICK, AND WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANIES AMALGAMATION BILL [H.L.].

Moved, "That Standing Order No. 144 be dispensed with in respect of this Bill."—(*The Earl of Cork.*)

On Question, motion agreed to.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read the third time."—(*The Earl of Cork.*)

On Question, Bill read 3ª.

Moved, "That the Bill do pass."—(*The Earl of Cork.*)

*LORD GREVILLE: I beg to move the Amendment standing in my name to Clause 25. If sub-sections such as are included in my Amendment are not inserted the Waterford Corporation will be deprived of the benefits which they have enjoyed for years past. The Amendment will not in any way injure the Bill, and I trust your Lordships will agree to it.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 25, pages 14 and 15, to leave out Sub-sections (6) and (7), and to insert the following sub-sections :—

"'(6) The company shall give on application so far as they themselves are concerned through bookings with through rates and fares for traffic of every description viâ the port of Waterford to and from all places in Great Britain from or to which they can be reasonably required.

"'(7) The said through bookings and through rates and fares may be applied for by the Waterford Corporation or by the Waterford Commissioners or by any incorporated steamship company regularly trading with the port of Waterford or by any other person interested in such through traffic.

"'(8) The Waterford Corporation and the Waterford Commissioners shall not oppose any application to Parliament which the Great Western Railway Company may make for relief from the obligation to continue to provide or afford a daily service by steamer as provided by Section 70 of the Fishguard and Rosslare Railways and Harbours Act, 1898.'" —(*Lord Greville.*)

EARL SPENCER: I am afraid it is rather difficult to explain the position of the mover of the Amendment as well as that of the Joint Committee who considered the Bill, but I think I must venture to do so. The Bill is a very important one, and I will admit that Limerick, Waterford, and other places are deeply interested in it. The Committee, therefore, went carefully into all these matters; they sat for a great many days, and this matter was discussed at great length before them. I do not know whether my noble friend is going to press this Amendment, but I think it right that I should state exactly what it is. Two years ago a very important Act was passed in respect of the Rosslare and Fishguard line, which immensely affected the whole traffic of the railways in the south of Ireland. That Act established a line of steamboats from Rosslare to Fishguard, and a good many conditions were imposed on the promoters, one being that the Great Southern and Western should give the line all the traffic they could. That Act will affect in an enormous degree the whole trade and commerce of the south and west of Ireland, and since it has been passed it has very much affected the position of the different railway companies in Ireland, almost necessitating the bringing forward of the Bill now before your Lordships. One of the clauses of the Bill is intended to protect all through traffic as before, wherever it goes. That clause remains. There was another clause affecting the future, but after a good deal of consultation and discussion the Committee decided against it. One of the clauses to protect the Harbour Commissioners of Waterford was that the Great Western of England, which is in close alliance with the Great Southern and Western, were to run a daily service of steamboats to Waterford as well as to Fishguard, and in that clause the through traffic obtained was to be carried by their lines to their own stations, or wherever their lines came in England. That was as the Bill came before us, but the Great Western of England opposed that clause, considering it hard and onerous upon them. The Committee considered the grievance, and came to the conclusion that the Great Western had something to say on the matter. Therefore they inserted a clause saying that, until the Great Western were relieved of their obligation to run a daily service of steamboats to Waterford, the same conditions should be imposed upon the Great Southern over the new amalgamated line as were placed on them in respect of their own lines in the Rosslare and Fishguard Bill. With every desire to give full protection to the different places, we came to the conclusion that that clause would be more just. My noble friend wishes to alter that. He seeks for a through traffic clause to all places in England, quite independently of the clause which was inserted in the Rosslare and Fishguard Bill, and then promises that if that is granted the Harbour Commissioners of Waterford will engage not to oppose any Bill brought forward by the Great Western. The Committee have fully considered this, and are not in a position to give way on that point. I confess that I do not think any great hardship will be imposed upon Waterford if the Bill stands as it is. I therefore oppose the Amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (The Earl of MORLEY): My Lords, I think it is hardly worth while to say anything in support of the view taken by the noble Earl who has just spoken, except to remind the House that this Bill was referred to a specially strong Joint Committee of both Houses, who sat for twenty-nine days, and that this particular question occupied a considerable time. I cannot believe that your Lordships will

be likely to reverse the decision arrived at after so much deliberation.

Amendment negatived.

*LORD GREVILLE: The object of the new clause which I now beg to move is to put a check on the working of the company, and to give to the Treasury powers which will secure the proper working of the line.

Moved—

"To insert as a new clause:—'If the Treasury shall be of opinion that the company is not properly working, maintaining, and developing the traffic on or over the railways of the Waterford Company, or over any railways heretofore worked by the Waterford Company, or that the through or local rates or fares charged upon those railways are unreasonable, they may call upon the company to make such alterations in its mode of working, maintaining, and developing traffic, or in the rates or fares charged, as they may think fit, and should the company fail to make such alterations within a reasonable time after notice to it to that effect, the Treasury may prefer a complaint against the company to the Railway and Canal Commission for an order directing such alterations to be made, and thereupon the said Commission may make such order on the complaint as to them may seem fit.'"—(*Lord Greville.*)

EARL SPENCER: I am afraid I must also oppose this Amendment. It involves a new principle in railroad legislation, and I do not myself believe that it is at all necessary. Under clauses in both Bills there is ample power to refer to arbitration any disputes as to the facilities—the wide facilities—which have been granted. The proposed clause would effect a sweeping change, and has never been before the Committee. The matter is of vast importance, and would make a revolution in railway legislation, at all events, in Ireland. I do not express an opinion as to whether it is right or wrong—it has not been discussed before the Committee—but I think the existing protection clauses sufficient.

THE EARL OF MORLEY: This clause appears on the Paper now for the first time, and the first I saw of it was a typewritten copy which was handed to me just before the House met. It is entirely out of the question to move it without giving notice.

Amendment negatived.

Bill passed, and sent to the Commons.

GREAT SOUTHERN AND WESTERN AND WATERFORD AND CENTRAL IRELAND RAILWAY COMPANIES AMALGAMATION BILL [H.L.].

Moved, "That Standing Order No. 144 be dispensed with in regard to this Bill."—(*The Earl of Cork.*)

On Question, motion agreed to.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read the third time."—(*The Earl of Cork.*)

*LORD GREVILLE: In rising to move that the Bill be read a third time this day three months it is very difficult for me in a few words to explain to your Lordships what took the Committee twenty-nine days to inquire into. But the Committee did not hear many points of interest in connection with the subject. A line was authorised in 1896 from Mountmellick to Mullingar, through the very centre of Ireland. The people of Mullingar and that region, whom I represent, wished the Committee to give them an extension of the power to build that line. Lord de Vesci and myself appeared before the noble Earl's Committee, but the Committee did not think it necessary to hear other witnesses who could have been produced, including two Irish Members of Parliament. I can quite understand that the Committee were weary and sick of the whole thing, but I cannot see why they would not consider the Mullingar grievance. It is an Irish grievance, and therefore, perhaps, not much thought of over here. The Mullingar line did not suit the octopus, the Great Southern and Western, which now has the whole of the south in its greedy tentacles, as it might be antagonistic to the Midland Great Western. The Committee have done an injustice to the centre of Ireland in not imposing the construction of this line on the promoters; and those who, with myself, originally obtained the powers in 1896 have lost much money over the project. It is all thrown away because the Joint Committee were too weary to go into the question. I have had many letters on the subject. A gentleman of great influence in Ireland writes—

"I do not know how the committees are formed in Parliament, but this one must have been formed to give everything to the Great Southern. No one on it understood the wants or wishes of Ireland in regard to this matter. No wonder we want Home Rule."

I would ask whether a clause could not be inserted which would give the people of the centre of Ireland the power to revive the Act of 1896 which at present is virtually dead. I am glad that the Committee have not accepted the demand of the Midland that they should be prevented from ever making the line, but I would suggest that the Great Southern be put under an obligation to introduce a Bill in the next session of Parliament to obtain an extension of time for the construction of the line from Mountmellick to Mullingar authorised by the Waterford and Central (Ireland) Act, 1896, and to use their best endeavours to obtain such powers, and on such powers being obtained, to proceed forthwith to construct such railway.

Amendment moved—

"To leave out 'now,' and insert at the end of the motion 'this day three months.'"—(*Lord Greville.*)

EARL SPENCER: My Lords, with regard to what my noble friend has said as to the Committee being so exhausted by the length of the inquiry and the weather that they would not inquire fully into this matter, I must give an entire and complete denial to the assertion. I confess that I was not very well when the inquiry began, but I came out of it much better in health. We were not deterred by the hot weather, or by anything else, from doing what we considered best in the interests of the people of Ireland. I sympathise with my noble friend in the original desire to extend the line from Mountmellick to Mullingar; but what has happened? The Act of 1896 was obtained, but the company were unable to raise money outside their own capital to carry the line to Mountmellick. The public would not support the rest of the extension, and the powers under the Bill have expired. The compulsory powers for the acquisition of land expired on 21st May last year. No doubt the power of making the line goes on till the 21st May next, but it will disappear then. That alone is, I think, a condemnation of the line. I am very sorry for my noble friend, and particularly for the friends whom he encouraged to subscribe to this line; but I am afraid they have made a very bad commercial speculation. They were not supported by the public, and the line has been practically killed not by this Bill, but under the Act of 1896. I, as chairman, may have been responsible in Committee for stopping counsel when they desired to go into irrelevant matters and into matters which the Committee had heard over and over again, but I entirely deny that I stopped counsel when they wanted to make a case. I entirely deny that I stopped the free discussion or the free speech of counsel. The Central of Ireland is an impecunious, almost a bankrupt concern—it was so poor that it could not run passenger trains without cattle—and it would have been a strong order to compel the company taking it over to construct a line with which the public had already refused to have anything to do.

On Question whether "now" shall stand part of the motion, resolved in the affirmative. Bill read 3ª accordingly; Amendments made; Bill passed, and sent to the Commons.

CRYSTAL PALACE COMPANY BILL [H.L.].

ROE'S PATENT BILL [H.L.].

Returned from the Commons agreed to.

BARNSLEY CORPORATION BILL [H.L.].

DUBLIN, WICKLOW, AND WEXFORD RAILWAY BILL [H.L.].

NORTH EASTERN RAILWAY BILL [H.L.].

RAMSGATE CORPORATION IMPROVEMENTS BILL [H.L.].

SOUTH SHIELDS CORPORATION BILL [H.L.].

Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments; the said Amendments considered, and agreed to.

NORTH BRITISH RAILWAY BILL [H.L.].

WALSALL CORPORATION BILL [H.L.].

Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments.

BEER RETAILERS' AND SPIRIT GROCERS' LICENCES (IRELAND) (No. 2) BILL.

ABERDEEN CORPORATION TRAMWAYS BILL.

GREAT WESTERN RAILWAY BILL.

LONDON AND SOUTH WESTERN RAILWAY BILL.

SOUTH METROPOLITAN GAS BILL.

Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

TRAMWAYS PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 5) BILL.

House in Committee (according to Order). The Amendment proposed by the Select Committee made; further Amendment made; Standing Committee negatived; the Report of Amendments to be received on Tuesday next.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 12) BILL.

House in Committee (according to Order). The Amendments proposed by the Select Committee made; Standing Committee negatived; the Report of Amendments to be received on Tuesday next.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 7) BILL.

House in Committee (according to Order). Bill reported without amendment; Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3ª on Monday next.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 15) BILL.

House in Committee (according to Order). Amendments made; Standing Committee negatived; the Report of Amendments to be received on Monday next.

PAISLEY WATERWORKS PROVISIONAL ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL.

EDINBURGH (HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES) IMPROVEMENT SCHEME PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

House in Committee (according to Order). Bills reported without Amendment; Standing Committee negatived; and Bills to be read 3ª on Tuesday next.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 4) BILL.

Read 3ª (according to Order), with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No 9) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 14) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 12) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 6) BILL.

PERTH AND PAISLEY GAS PROVISIONAL ORDERS BILL.

Read 3ª (according to Order), and passed.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

MUNICIPAL TRADING.

Report from the Joint Committee (with the Proceedings of the Committee) made, and to be printed. (No. 210.)

NATIONAL EDUCATION (IRELAND).

I. Annual Report of the Commissioners, for the year 1899-1900.

II. Appendices (Sections i., ii., iii., and iv.).

CHINA, No. 3 (1900).

Correspondence respecting the insurrectionary movement in China.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

No. 2488. Guatemala.
No. 2490. Sweden (Gothenburg).

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

INEBRIATE RETREATS (RULES AS TO MANAGEMENT).

Regulations made with the approval of the Secretary of State for the Home Department for the domestic management of the Corngreaves Hall Retreat, licensed as a Retreat under the Inebriates Acts, 1879 to 1899.

IRISH LAND COMMISSION (PURCHASE OF LAND (IRELAND) ACT, 1891).

Return of Advances under the Act during the year ended the 31st March, 1900.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

LONDON CORPORATION.

Annual Account of the Chamberlain of London. Delivered (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

STRENGTH AND ORGANISATION OF HOME DEFENCES.

*THE EARL OF WEMYSS: My Lords, I beg to ask the Prime Minister—(1) whether he or his colleagues have ever received information or expressions of opinion from reliable sources confirming the view of one of our foreign military

attachés, recently quoted in debate, to the effect that—

It is all important that England should be strong and unassailable in the month of November next;

(2) whether he is of opinion that the European situation is now less alarming than it seemed to him on the 9th of May last when he spoke to the Primrose League as follows—

"It is not necessarily because in themselves they are more important, but if you look around you will see that the elements and causes of menace and peril are, though slowly, accumulating, and may accumulate to such a point as to require our most earnest and active effort to repel them";

(3) whether, as Prime Minister responsible for our national safety, he has carefully inquired into our home land defensive means and organisation, and has satisfied himself that these are such as, failing the Fleet, will render all attempts at invasion by any hostile nation futile and impossible of success; (4) whether, if not satisfied as to the sufficiency and organisation of our home land defences, he will cause such measures to be taken as will give us the required security against the possibility of successful invasion by any hostile Power. I have to apologise to my noble friend the Prime Minister for venturing to put these questions on the Paper, but I think he and your Lordships will admit that the matters to which they refer are sufficiently important to justify my having done so. I think your Lordships will also admit that, as we are approaching the close of the present session, it is desirable that we should receive, if possible, from the Prime Minister, a more comforting assurance as to the state of our home defences. In the few words which I think it necessary to utter in putting these questions to the noble Marquess I shall, I hope, avoid saying anything that could possibly give offence to the susceptibilities of any nation; indeed, I propose not to refer to any nation, but to make my remarks general on the subject of home defence. It will be remembered that in the debate on 20th February last on the Militia Ballot resolution,* I quoted from a letter I had received from one of our military attachés abroad, in which he expressed his satisfaction that I was endeavouring to get a Volunteer Reserve, and then used these words, which I have placed on the Paper:—

"It is all-important that England should be strong and unassailable in the month of November next."

Within the last three days I have received another letter from my correspondent in which he says he still holds to what he wrote eight or nine months ago. This seems to me to establish a rather serious and critical situation, especially as I have been informed that Her Majesty's Government have received—I do not know whether they attach weight to it or not—similar information from many quarters. In February last my noble friend Lord Rosebery, defending a motion designed to make the Ballot Bill workable, said, in almost passionate language, that he considered that we were in a national crisis, or used words to that effect. My noble friend the Earl of Kimberley followed in the course of that debate, and also used words as to the importance of the crisis in which we found ourselves, and argued that it was most desirable that we should make our Militia strong for home defence. All this only leads to what I am about to say. On the 25th May the Prime Minister, addressing the members of the Primrose League, used the words quoted in the second paragraph of my question—

"But if you look around you will see that the elements and causes of menace and peril are, though slowly, accumulating, and may accumulate to such a point as to require our most earnest and active efforts to repel them."

I have now to ask whether anything has occurred since May last to modify the view of my noble friend the Prime Minister. The danger we run is this: that these evils will go on accumulating until the thundercloud bursts. The question which arises is: shall we be prepared to meet it? Has the noble Marquess come to the conclusion, after full inquiry, that our home defences are in a thoroughly satisfactory state? There are, in this country, two schools of national defence. My noble friend Lord Rosebery and others have been at Eton, and they will remember that at Eton there are two sets of boys. One set delight in the river, and say the river is everything; the other set take their pleasure in the playing-field. Those who devote themselves to the river are called "wet bobs," and those who look to the playing fields for their

* See *The Parliamentary Debates* [Fourth Series], Vol. lxxix., p. 504.

amusement are termed "dry bobs"; and the "wet bobs" are apt to look down on the "dry bobs." As it is at Eton so it is in these schools, if I may so call them, of national defence. You have one school that swears by the Navy and the Navy alone, who say that all we want is a strong Navy, and that if we have a Navy stronger than any other two this nation is perfectly safe. But there is this inconsistency in their views. If it is necessary to anchor part of our Navy in the Channel for the protection of our shores, we *pro tanto* diminish the power of our Fleet for operations elsewhere, no matter how large that Fleet may be. When they are asked, "Are you so satisfied with what the Navy can do for the protection of our shores that you are ready to give up all home defences?" they immediately reply, "No." Therefore, the whole of the Navy "wet bob" argument falls to the ground, because we cannot trust absolutely to the Fleet. I am not ashamed to say that in this matter of defence I am a "dry bob." I quite feel that we ought to have the largest possible Navy for the purpose not of home defence, but of pursuing the enemy's fleet and commerce, shutting them up in ports, and protecting our own commerce. But I want the country to be absolutely independent of the Navy for home defence, and the home defences to be so organised as to give us —to quote the words of my question— the required security against the possibility of successful invasion by any hostile Power. I have asked my noble friend to himself see whether we are in that state. We never have been in that state since 1815. Everything that has been done since has shown it. What was the Duke of Wellington's letter to Sir John Burgoyne but an admission that we were not in a satisfactory state so far as our home defences were concerned? What was his last speech in your Lordships' House? It was in favour of the Militia Ballot Bill of Lord Palmerston, and contained an admission that we were not strong at home and required an efficient Militia. What was General Peel's letter which summoned the Volunteer force but an admission that as things then were we were not in a satisfactory state as regards home defences? What was Lord Cardwell's Army Bill but an admission that we were not, in the year 1870, in a satisfactory state of home defence? But how as to now? Will my noble friend be able to say that we are in a satisfactory state now? The noble Marquess sitting on his right, the Secretary for War, is satisfied that we are not in a satisfactory state for home defence, for every measure he brings in is what he calls a measure of emergency; and the last thing, apparently, from the answer he gave yesterday, is his proposal to put the whole military system into the crucible or smelting-pot. The noble Marquess shakes his head, but is it not putting the military system into the smelting-pot when he is going to do away with the Militia Reserve and to change the constitution of the Militia, so that instead of being only for home defence it is to be liable to be sent abroad? That may be right or it may be wrong, but it is a revolution in our Army organisation and in the principle of the defence of this country. I venture then to ask my noble friend if he has inquired into this question and compared the facts obtained as regards our means of defence with the means of aggression of other Powers. If he has done that, I hope he will be able to answer the questions by saying that our home defences and organisation are such as, failing the Fleet, will render all attempts at invasion by any hostile nation futile and impossible of success. I have only to say one word with regard to the last question. If my noble friend's inquiry has not satisfied him that we are in that state, will he take care that we are put in a condition of absolute security against the possibility of successful invasion by any hostile power? To contemplate, not invasion, but the possibility of the threat of invasion, and preparations for invasion such as were made in the early part of last century is something to give one a cold shudder as to the effect it would have in this country. There was an excellent book—I strongly advise your Lordships to read it—published in 1852 by Sir Francis Head, Bart., entitled "The Defenceless State of Great Britain." After showing the dangers we ran in the early part of last century, he has two chapters on the "Capture of London." The first chapter begins as follows—

"As soon as by a few quivering motions of two needles there had almost simultaneously appeared upon the white dials of all the electric telegraphs throughout the United Kingdom the three words 'They are landed,'

what a variety of sensations would be created in the hearts of fundholders, landowners, place holders, owners of property of every description!"

One set of gentlemen he has not referred to, and those are the gentlemen who live in Pall Mall. I wonder in such a case what their feelings would be. My opinion is that they would decorate the lamp-posts in Pall Mall. We owe it not only to our homes, not only to everything that is dear to us, not only to the past history of this country, but we owe it to our colonies, who have so nobly come forward in the Empire's defence, and whose sons have shown their gallantry and so freely shed their blood in South Africa; we owe it to them as well as to ourselves that we should be strong at the heart and impregnable at home. I do not know whom the noble Marquess has consulted with reference to the answer he will give to these questions—I hope they are not all official answers from Pall Mall—but I wish he would consult the illustrious Duke who was for so many years the Field Marshal Commander-in-Chief of the Army. If he consulted the noble Duke I should be very surprised if he did not find that his views on home defence and the duties of the Government in that respect—which are to enforce the existing law, and not to go tinkering and tailoring with some other law—are not far from being in accordance with those with which on more than one occasion I have troubled your Lordships. I now venture to ask the questions standing in my name.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (The Marquess of SALISBURY): My Lords, I shall best comply with the wish of my noble friend that I should answer the questions which he has put on the Notice Paper by taking them one by one. The first question is, "Whether I or my colleagues"—I cannot answer for my colleagues—"have ever received information or expressions of opinion from reliable sources confirming the view of one of our foreign military attachés"—I wonder who that person is; I know nothing about him—"recently quoted in debate"—yes, quoted by the noble Lord. And he has the courage to come here and quote himself as an authority, for he has no other authority whatever——

The Earl of Wemyss.

*THE EARL OF WEMYSS: I beg your pardon; I do not quote myself as an authority.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: You quoted it; nobody else did.

*THE EARL OF WEMYSS: What I quoted was a letter from one of your own officials.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: Who is he?

*THE EARL OF WEMYSS: I decline to say; you have no right to ask me.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: You have no right to say that.

*THE EARL OF WEMYSS: I beg your pardon——

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: The noble Lord has no right to use a private letter in this way, and quote it in this House as an evidence of a public fact, when he cannot bring the testimony of the man from whom it comes as evidence that it is not a pure invention. I have only to reply that I have never heard that "it is all-important that England should be strong and unassailable in the month of November next." I believe there is to be a great collection of shooting stars in the early part of November—that is the only peculiarity in the month of November that I know of that we need apprehend. The noble Lord then asks me whether it is my opinion that the European situation is now less alarming than when in the month of May I used certain words of which he quotes a very small portion. My Lords, I did my best on that occasion to express myself clearly, and I was anxious to avoid precisely that misconception into which the noble Lord has fallen. I pointed out at that time what was well known to everybody—that the attitude of foreign Powers towards us was absolutely correct, and showed the utmost goodwill towards this country; that we had in this respect nothing to complain of; that there was nothing in their action from which we could deduce any unfavourable inferences. I stated that in debate, I think in answer to the noble Lord opposite, and I repeated it afterwards at the meeting in Albert Hall, to which the noble Lord has referred. At

the same time, I drew attention to another class of phenomena having nothing to do with the attitude of the Governments of the day. It was impossible to conceal from our eyes, especially then, that there was, not assuredly in the language of Governments or statesmen, but in the organs of popular opinion in many parts of the world, and especially in Europe, that which indicated a state of feeling towards this country which could not but fill us with feelings of apprehension, or at all events of regret, and which we could not dismiss from our minds. The object I had in drawing the attention of my fellow-countrymen to this state of things was that they should not allow themselves to rely too entirely upon the correct and benevolent attitude of Governments, but bear in mind that in the long run Governments are influenced by the feeling of the people over whom they rule, and that if that feeling continued hostile to us we must be prepared to take account of the phenomenon in making our preparations. That was undoubtedly true then, but nobody, I should have thought, would have read that speech without knowing that I was not pointing to any immediate danger or necessity for immediate precautions. The mere fact that again and again I carefully guarded myself from seeming to imply that there was anything in the conduct or attitude of foreign countries to cause us disquiet or apprehension, showed that it was not to immediate danger that I was pointing the attention of my countrymen, but that I was urging upon them a general consideration of the duties imposed on every nation by the increase of means of communication in the present day, and urging that the apprehensions which might be caused now from these circumstances and from the proximity of danger were greater than they would have been many years ago, and that, therefore, we were bound, not by any sudden revolutionary measures of defence, not by any startling efforts or any violent change of the policy we had pursued, but by a steady concentration of our view upon the special danger of our own generation and our own time—we were bound to bring our nation gradually to the performance of those duties of self-defence which have been long imposed by necessity upon other nations of the world, and which, perhaps, have lain upon us in a less formidable character in consequence of the defence which we enjoy from the possession of the sea as a barrier. I am not going to trouble the House with reading my speech made at the Albert Hall—I would not so waste the time of the House—but no one can read that speech without seeing that I did not speak then of any imminent pressing danger, or of any precautions that required immediate adoption. I was trying to guide, so far as it was given me to do so, the minds of my fellow-countrymen into the conduct with respect to national defence which the changing conditions of national security are slowly pressing on the nation to which we belong. That is what I have to say of my speech to the Primrose League. I do not wish any noble Lord, unless he chooses, to undertake the somewhat severe condition of reading it in its entirety, but I am convinced he will not, if he does, attribute to it such a false interpretation as that which has commended itself to the noble Lord. Then he asks me whether I have satisfied myself that our home land defences are such as, failing the fleet, would render all atempts at invasion by any hostile nation futile and impossible of success. I really do not know how I should begin to address myself to that inquiry. Nobody has yet succeeded in invading this country since William the Conqueror unless he has had assistance from inside. Of course, that is not what the noble Lord meant; he has some fanciful or personal test of national security which he requires us to fulfil. But I maintain that the onus is on the other side; it is for him to show the dangers to which he says we are exposed, and if he shows this correctly, then I admit he is doing good and patriotic service in calling attention to their existence, and I fully acknowledge the duty which lies upon us above all other things of preventing any real and substantial danger of the kind. But I cannot prove a negative. I cannot prove there is no danger unless he indicates to me from what side it is to come, or in consequence of what circumstances that danger exists. I do not profess to be able to go into the minute details of our national defence by sea or by land. I am afraid that in our complex civilisation it is necessary for us to trust largely to the testimony and to the vigilance of experts in whom you have confidence; and I should rather refer, and I hold it to be

my duty to refer, in the first instance to the great precaution which I have had a share in taking for protecting this country, and that is by recommending an adequate and thoroughly trustworthy head of the War Office for the defence of the country. I cannot profess to tell the noble Lord whether all our muskets are of the right calibre, or whether all our guns are of the best pattern that can be adopted—that is not my business. I must in such matters rely on the assurances of experts. As far as my judgment goes, as far as my knowledge carries me—I do not think it is very far—it appears to me that our defensive systems are quite as effective and in as thoroughly satisfactory a condition as ever they have been before. I suppose the fact that they have led us up to this particular point of security without any serious danger or apprehension may give us confidence in the future. I do not profess to have examined the details of every circumstance of defence; I can only say that, as far as they have come under my observation they are thoroughly satisfactory and such as to give us sufficient confidence in the future. The noble Earl appears to think that he has made out an excellent case by speaking of all the changes which all the Ministers for a hundred years past have from time to time proposed for increasing and developing our national defences. Of course such proposals have been made, and of course such proposals are now being made by my noble friend the Minister for War. If it is the doctrine of the noble Lord that you cannot propose any amendment of your defensive system without admitting that that defensive system is unsatisfactory, of course you may much simplify the duty of defence and of legislation in respect to Army matters. But that is an absurd test to apply. We believe that we are satisfactorily defended; we believe that we have been so defended for some time past, and we appeal to history as our test, but we do not think that we are by that fact relieved from the duty of constantly watching the organisation over which we preside and trying to introduce into it every improvement which experience or reflection can induce us to adopt. That, I think, is the only course possible with respect to national defence, which manifestly must be progressive, and the merits of which up to a certain extent must depend upon hypothetical dangers such as the noble Lord has adopted to himself. We do not see these dangers, we do see the necessity for constant improvement, and as we go on, and as facts and the guidance of experts induce us to modify our system, we shall not fail to do so; but we indignantly repudiate the insinuation that, because we attempt constantly to make improvements and add to the efficiency of our national defence, we are therefore admitting that we all this time have been sitting down under an inadequate system, and that most serious dangers have really beset us in the past, though we professed the greatest security. I need not say that I am not dissatisfied as to the sufficiency and the organisation of our home land defences; that I do not admit that inefficiency is proved by the fact of our having attempted to develop, expand, and strengthen our system. We shall continue so to develop and expand it. But we cannot for a moment accept the suggestion that we have not taken, as our predecessors have taken, the required security against the possibility of a successful invasion by any hostile Power, which was only once dreamed of, and idly dreamed of, by Napoleon at the culmination of his career, and which no foreign Power now dreams of as a possible contingency for an enemy of England to contemplate. I do not admit the possibility of successful invasion on the part of any hostile Power. If the noble Earl can prove it, can show it, and give us ground for believing it, let him do so; but if he cannot do so, I do not think that he serves his country by the constant repetition of impossible apprehensions and unfounded complaints.

THE EARL OF ROSEBERY: My Lords, I cannot help regretting that the noble Marquess the Prime Minister has imported so much heat into his reply to my noble friend on the Cross Benches. I am not here to defend the motion or the questions of my noble friend. He is imbued with a perpetual youth and a perpetual vitality which put his questions beyond the reach of my observation or criticism. But I confess I think he would have been better advised if he had left out the reference to the letter of the anonymous military attaché, who I trust will always remain anonymous. But at the same time, he touched upon a point as to which the Government seem to be quite

unaware—I mean with regard to the anxiety which is felt in the country. That anxiety has been greatly intensified by the speech which the noble Marquess delivered to the Primrose League, and which, no doubt, caused a much greater impression than could have been caused by the remarks of an irresponsible person. The noble Marquess wishes us to go home and read it in its entirety. I do not think I should sleep to-night if I did; at any rate, I do not propose to take that course; but what I do recollect distinctly, after my first, and probably my second, perusal of that speech, was the extraordinarily inadequate conclusion up to which these depressing arguments of the noble Marquess led. What he said, and said with perfect truth, was that though the attitudes of the Governments on the Continent were essentially correct, yet they were the dams to a flood of public opinion hostile to this country which might at any moment break down those dams and sweep in a torrent—I think the metaphor is his own—against the rocks of this island. Now, my Lords, after all, if that be the condition of things—I think it may have ameliorated since then, but not altogether, for no one can put a foot on the Continent of Europe anywhere without knowing that that is the state of things, and that we are surrounded with an atmosphere of hatred unprecedented, I hope, in the history of this country—if that be the condition of things, the conclusion of the noble Marquess was totally inadequate. It is not enough to tell the Primrose League, however numerous, however efficient, and however intelligent that body may be, to form itself spontaneously into rifle clubs to protect our liberties, our properties, and our national existence. I know it has been said on high authority that we are only hated because we are so strong—the argument apparently being that under former Governments we were feeble and beloved—but that now because we are so strong, because we have so vast a body of our national resources locked up 7,000 miles away, and because we have the prospect of another great body of our national resources being locked up still further away—because we are now so strong we are now hated. Suppose we are hated and not so strong! On what does our strength rest? What are the assurances that we have had that we are so strong? The noble Marquess gives us his assurance on that point, but he will forgive me for saying that that will carry no conviction to my mind whatever. He was asked, with a directness which was, perhaps, more enthusiastic than discreet, if, as Prime Minister, responsible for our national safety, he has carefully inquired into our home land defensive means and organisation, and if he has satisfied himself, and so forth. Well, that is a question which I can well understand the noble Marquess not desiring to answer directly and by itself. It is a very direct and a pertinent question, but what was the answer of the noble Marquess? It was that, so far as the matter had come to his notice, he was of opinion that our resources were adequate. Now, I have the greatest respect for the noble Marquess, but I confess that that gives me no feeling of security whatever. He says, again, that we rely on our past history to give us a sense of security. Unhappy is the nation that relies for its security on its past history! Then the noble Marquess tells us he relies on the opinion of experts. If he will give us the opinion of experts we will rely on them too. My noble friend the Secretary of State for War has made innumerable statements in this House. He has led a most laborious life, both inside and outside this House; and I for one am the last to disparage his administration of the great Department over which he presides or the success which has attended his efforts. He has developed schemes for our national defence, but when he has been developing them I have been asking myself the question which I ask the noble Marquess, and which I ask your Lordships now—where are the experts? The noble Marquess the Secretary of State for War cannot be an expert; it is part of our extraordinary policy never to put an expert at the head of our naval or military services; but he has an expert in that office, the Field Marshal Commanding-in-Chief. He is practised in oratory, he is fond of oratory. I do not think I am going too far in saying that, but on no one occasion has it been my good fortune to see the noble Lord the Commander-in-Chief present to give the weight of his assurance in support of the schemes suggested by the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for War. I must say this, with all the deference

that I feel for the two noble Marquesses and for my noble friend the President of the Council of National Defence, who, I fear, is no exception to the rule to which I have alluded—that we do not place experts at the head of our naval and military services—there has not been one single sentence from the noble Viscount the Commander-in-Chief assuring us that we were amply prepared for all contingencies in view of the known facts of the hostility of the people of Europe, of the drain on our Indian resources, of the drain on our home resources, and the increasing requirements which events in the Far East are likely to place on those resources. I should be more satisfied, my Lords, with one single sentence from the noble Viscount than with a thousand speeches to the Primrose League. My Lords, this is a very grave matter. We are about to separate for a prolonged recess. It will be the good fortune of your Lordships, whatever may happen in the Long Vacation, to reassemble in your full numbers, without damage to life or limb from any political occurrence, when Parliament reassembles next year. But there are probabilities, possibilities, I know not what to call them, of which I know that the Prime Minister knows nothing, because I heard him say so last night. But there are possibilities and probabilities which point to a great political convulsion in the course of the autumn, and which, of course, implies that the House of Commons, on adjourning for the holidays in August, will adjourn not to meet again. Is it too much to ask of the Government that before that event occurs we should be placed in possession of the opinions of those experts which are so reassuring to them and would be so reassuring to us? I would not limit the wish to what my noble friend, in his racy manner, calls the "dry bobs" of military defence. I should be very glad to hear the expert opinion of your "wet bob" chiefs—I do not mean Mr. Goschen, but the men in command of our fleets—the Mediterranean fleet, for example—to know if they are quite satisfied as to our preparedness for the dreadful issue of battle. God grant that it may not occur, but the facts to which the noble Marquess has called our attention, and to which others called our attention even before his Primrose League speech, are matters of public notoriety. Speeches, however eloquent, will not remove or get over them; and I venture to say that it is the opinion of the vast majority of the community of this country that a few reassuring words founded on expert knowledge with regard to our preparedness for the eventualities which may occur either this year or the next would be a profound consolation.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (The Marquess of LANSDOWNE): My Lords, I do not know whether it is altogether becoming that I should intervene in this discussion. I call to mind an old saying which is, I think, of classic origin—that those who were fortunate enough to obtain the attention of Jupiter could afford to disregard altogether the minor divinities. The noble Earl has appealed to Jupiter, and has had his reply. I should not intervene but for what has been said by the noble Earl who has just sat down. The noble Earl said he was not contented with mere assurances from this Front Bench. He said, "Give us some facts." Well, my Lords, I have on more than one occasion——

THE EARL OF ROSEBERY: I said expert opinion.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: I will come to the experts in a moment. We were asked, in the first place, for the facts. I believe on more than one occasion I came down to the House and submitted to your Lordships statements of facts supplied by those very experts whose opinion the noble Earl wishes to obtain. Let me enumerate one or two of the facts of the case. We have at this moment in South Africa the largest military force this country has ever put into the field. We have been maintaining that force in point of numbers and equipment for some months past. I trust that hostilities may now be drawing to a close, but up to the present time we have been steadily pouring into South Africa the drafts of men and the supplies of horses and of materials required to keep that great army in the field. In spite of that, it is a fact that there are at this moment in the country under arms about 50,000 more men than we have barrack accommodation for in the United Kingdom. I cite that to your Lordships as some evidence that the country is not in that denuded state which the two noble Earls would have us suppose. Then we have raised emergency battalions.

The noble Earl (the Earl of Rosebery) was not in the House the other night when I read textually the opinion of the Commander-in-Chief upon the efficiency and value of those battalions. Lord Wolseley spoke of them—I read his own words*—in the highest possible terms. Then there is in this country a great force of embodied Militia. With regard to the state of the Militia, I quoted to your Lordships not the opinion of War Office civilian officials, but the opinion of an expert, of the general officer whose business it is to inspect the embodied Militia. I also referred to the measures which have been taken to increase the efficiency of the Volunteer force, of whom, as your Lordships know, a very large number are going into special camps for special instruction altogether different from that which they have received in ordinary years. Again, with regard to these Volunteer battalions, I gave to your Lordships the verdict of the military expert whose business it is to inspect these battalions and to visit one camp after another during the training season. In addition to all that, we have for some time past been engaged upon the task of re-arming our defences. We are increasing our horse and field artillery, and we have made considerable progress in doing so, and we have, besides that, added to the permanent strength of the infantry. The noble Earl is not satisfied when I come to your Lordships from the War Office and tell you what I learn from my military advisers there. He says, "Why do you not bring down your Commander-in-Chief and put him up to deliver reassuring speeches in your Lordships' House?" I confess there is a view of that proposal which presents itself forcibly to my mind, and which, I suppose, has not occurred to the noble Earl. I think if you were to make it a *sine qua non* that the military officer whom you put in command of the forces of this country is to have assigned to him as part of his official duties the duty of coming down to Parliament and making speeches in defence of Government measures, you would be very apt to do what to my mind would be a very mistaken thing indeed—to turn your Commander-in-Chief into something like a political partisan. I trust I shall not live to see that practice introduced into your Lordships' House. The noble Earl who spoke first read us a long lecture upon the danger of depending entirely upon the protection of the Fleet. I do not think any one of my colleagues has ever adopted the extreme view that it is possible to secure the safety of these islands by reliance on the Fleet alone. We have, on the contrary, all of us, invariably admitted that it was necessary not only that we should have for our first line of defence a strong and thoroughly-equipped Fleet, but also, for home defence, a sufficient force to defend these shores from the attack of an invader at a moment when a large part of the naval forces of the Crown might be engaged at a distance. I cannot help asking your Lordships whether these infructuous criticisms really carry us very much further towards the attainment of that degree of security for which the two noble Earls sigh so much. When I have asked the noble Earl below the gangway (the Earl of Rosebery) what he had to propose, he has replied, "It is your business to tell us. It is not my business, so long as I am out of office." But I do think that when we have these perpetual attempts to belittle and ridicule everything which is done by Her Majesty's Government we have a right to ask the noble Earl that he should at least give us some indication as to the defects of what we ourselves propose, and some indication of the measures which, if he were called to power, he himself would adopt. On no occasion has the noble Earl ever come to that point. He repeats these turgid sentences, belittling and ridiculing what we have done, but he never gives us the slightest hint or indication of what he would do in a position of equal responsibility. The noble Earl does not very much differ in his practical proposals from the noble Earl who spoke first. The Earl of Wemyss has two practical proposals to make. One is, "Give me the Militia ballot." I have shown your Lordships again and again that if you had the Militia ballot to-morrow it would not give you that accession of strength which the noble Earl desires to obtain for the purpose of meeting the present emergency. The noble Earl knows perfectly well that it would not give him a trained man by the 1st November next—that magical date which he has insisted upon so much to-night. The other remedy of the noble

* See *The Parliamentary Debates* [Fourth Series], Vol. lxxxv., page 204.

Earl is a far simpler one. He proposes to hang somebody. When he made his last speech he was contented with hanging a single individual. I imagine I was the destined victim. But to-night he proposes to hang the whole of the Secretaries of State who have held office at the War Office since the Crimean War.

*THE EARL OF WEMYSS: No.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: I am sorry I cannot place myself at the disposal of the noble Earl for that purpose, but I do trust that when he next brings this subject before the House he will at least have some practical alternative to offer in place of the measures which we, after deliberation and careful consultation with our expert advisers, have laid before Parliament and the country.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: I shall say very little, because most of the arguments which can be used have been already exhausted; but I should think myself wanting in my duty if I did not express the opinions which I hold upon the very serious matters which have been brought to the attention of your Lordships by the noble Earl the Earl of Rosebery. The noble Marquess who has just sat down twitted my noble friend with not having made adequate proposals to, I suppose, increase our military and naval power. He says he criticises and finds fault with the present Government, but he does not give a hint to show what might have been done better. That is a very old gibe against the Opposition, which has no effect whatever on my mind. It is not the business of the Opposition to propose measures. It is the business of the Government of the day to propose measures on its responsibility, and it is the duty of the Opposition, if they are not satisfied with those measures, to point that out, and, if need be, to take the opinion of Parliament and of the country upon them.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: Hear, hear!

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: I am not going to place myself in a position of violent antagonism to noble Lords opposite. I recognise, in the first place, that the times are extremely critical. The occurrences in various parts of the world are such as may perplex the wisest statesmen, and although I by no means approve and commend everything which noble Lords opposite have done, I hope I have shown some consciousness that if I have any power at all I should not use it to weaken the Government in the conduct of affairs in times which are difficult and even dangerous in their character. I rather regretted the very strong expression in the speech of the noble Marquess to the Primrose League. I am not speaking now from an opinion formed at this moment, but I rather regretted it at the time. I thought the views he enunciated as to the hostility which existed in so many countries against us were sound and well founded, but I thought, if he will allow me to say so, considering the position he occupies—one that is not only very important as Prime Minister of the country, but even still more important from the long experience he has had of foreign affairs—I thought, if he will allow me to say so, that he somewhat exceeded what was desirable in the very strong opinion that he expressed on that occasion. Those who read and hear platform speeches are very apt indeed to not thoroughly comprehend the precise meaning attached to them by men experienced in the very difficult subject of foreign affairs, and I think that when they read the speech of the noble Marquess the greater mass of them did not appreciate —I certainly did myself—the distinction which he drew with regard to a danger which is accumulating and which may have very considerable effect as regards the necessity of strong military and naval defences in this country at a period not yet arrived. I do not think the ordinary public would discriminate, as no doubt they ought to have discriminated, between that and the expression of opinion, as they read it, that they were surrounded by a danger of an immediate and dangerous imminency. I thought the expression of that was somewhat unfortunate. I have myself always thought it was a very satisfactory thing that, so far, notwithstanding this hostile feeling, the Governments of the various countries have shown no unfriendly feeling towards us. I have always felt that that was a phenomenon which might make us seriously reflect that possibly, certainly not in my remembrance, never was there so unfriendly a feeling all over Europe

towards this country as there is now—a feeling the real foundation for which I have never been able to understand, but which makes it the more dangerous in my view, because an unreasoning hostility is just the one which is the most difficult to meet. But I think my noble friend Lord Rosebery was justified in what he said as regards the desirability of knowing what the expert opinion is; but I agree with the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for War, and differ from my noble friend, upon the point of whether we ought to have the Commander-in-Chief appearing in this House and undertaking duties which, in my opinion, can only be discharged by a responsible Minister. I should myself, like my noble friend, attach the highest importance, no doubt, to a speech made by the Commander-in-Chief, but our Parliamentary system is such that if you were to bring experts down to this House, and they were to usurp the position of the Minister, you would sap the very foundations upon which our whole political arrangements are based. If the Commander-in-Chief comes here and makes his statement, the First Naval Lord must come here and make his statement. I think it would be impossible for any Minister to undertake the conduct of either the Military or the Naval Department of the State if the experts were to be set up as the great authorities in Parliament. But whilst I say that, I limit it entirely to the point of the expert appearing here or in the House of Commons, and I do think the Government ought to carefully give us, on their own responsibility, the authentic statements they have received from their experts, so far as the interests of the public service permit of the public expression of such opinions. That course would not tend to weaken the Government. On the contrary, it would tend to strengthen the Government by strengthening the public confidence in the statement made by the Government, and the public would understand that, when the statement of a Minister was not accompanied by the expert's opinion, circumstances rendered it necessary that that opinion should not be published. I do not think that the laying of the experts' opinions before Parliament would have the effect of calming the public mind. There is no doubt that there is a feeling of uneasiness in the public mind; and no one can deny that there is cause for it. Look around upon the position of affairs. We have the flower of the British Army locked up in South Africa in a war that may drag on for some time, and upon the top of that great undertaking we have a state of affairs in China which seems to puzzle the wisest statesmanship of Europe and America. I do not think anyone would venture to foretell what will take place in China. It may be that the revolutionary movement will subside, and that we may obtain satisfaction from the Chinese Government for the terrible atrocities we have only too much reason to fear have been committed. It may be, on the other hand, that portions of that enormous country may fall into a state of disorganisation and disturbance which may, in the first place, endanger the life of every European and American who has the ill-fortune to be in that country, which may, in the second place, destroy the trade carried on with that country, and, in the third place, place the European and American Powers in a position of extreme difficulty; for if they have to destroy the Government of China they will have to substitute another in its place, and can you conceive a duty more difficult that could be laid on what is called the European Concert, or more likely to lead to most serious results? As my noble friend has said, we are about to separate for probably a considerable time, and we must earnestly hope that Her Majesty's Government will devote themselves to seeing that, in the opinion of those experts whom they consult and trust, everything is being done that can properly be expected to be done to place this country in a position of thorough safety, and to induce a feeling of public contentment.

POST OFFICE SITES BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (The Marquess of LONDONDERRY): My Lords, this Bill is, in principle, the same as those which have been submitted for the past twenty years, and which have always passed through your Lordships' House without opposition. Under this Bill, which has been considered in the House of Commons both by the Select Committee and by Committee of the

whole House, the Post Office obtain powers to clear sites in London, Bristol, Ilford, Sheffield, and Southampton. The Postmaster General is empowered to erect buildings on the lands taken, but all persons interested will be entitled to compensation under the Lands Clauses Act. I may say, to remove some apprehension which has been felt, that there will be no alteration made in Post Office Court, between Lombard Street and King William Street. Certain provisions have been inserted for the protection of sewers and streets in London, and Mr. Hanbury stated in the House of Commons that these provisions would be extended so as to apply to all the local authorities in the districts where sites will be acquired. Up to now it invariably has been the custom that not more than ten houses shall be taken compulsorily. In Bristol there is a larger number of houses intended to be taken, but Mr. Hanbury has undertaken to provide for the rehousing of any of the labouring classes who may be dispossessed.

Moved, "That the Bill be read a second time."—(*The Marquess of Londonderry.*)

On Question, agreed to. Bill read 2ª accordingly, and committed for Monday next.

AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS BILL.

House in Committee (according to Order).

Clause 1 :—

*EARL GREY said the object of the Amendment he rose to move was to restore a proviso which was deliberately inserted, after full consideration by both Houses of Parliament, in the Act of 1883, and which made it compulsory upon every valuer and referee appointed under that Act to have regard, in making the valuation of any agricultural improvement, to what was justly due to the inherent capabilities of the soil. He understood that there was no difference whatever between the Parliament of 1883 and the Government which was responsible for the introduction of this Bill so far as the point of principle was concerned. He did not understand that any member of the Government denied that a valuer ought to take into account what was justly due to the inherent capabilities of the soil. While in 1883 it was held to be absolutely necessary, as a precaution against possible confiscation and injustice, that every valuer should have regard to the inherent capabilities of the soil, and that he should be instructed by statute to have such regard, the Government now proposed that no statutory instructions should be given to the valuers, as they believed that every valuer would naturally have regard to what was justly due to the inherent capabilities of the soil. That was a very unsatisfactory position to be in. He understood the proviso was dropped out of the present Bill on the recommendation of the Royal Commission of 1887, who thought it was obnoxious to many and unnecessary, and that referees, in estimating the tenant's interest in the value of an improvement, would take into consideration the character of the soil, its natural fertility and capabilities, without any instruction by statute. Every fair valuer would do so, but legislation was introduced not to guide the conduct of fair men, but to make unfair men carry out their duty. He was apprehensive that there were valuers who would not act in the way suggested. The President of the Board of Agriculture, speaking in the House of Commons, repudiated the possibility of valuers considering the effect of agricultural operations without considering the capacity of the soil. But if it was right for a valuer to have regard to the inherent capabilities of the soil, why was that not stated honestly and straightforwardly in the Bill, so that all the world could understand it? How was it likely the valuers would construe their duties? They were hard-working, absolutely fearless and honest men, who would go to the statute, and the statute only, for their instructions. They would see that they were required to determine that as compensation such a sum should be given as fairly represented the value of the improvement to the incoming tenant. If his sense of justice suggested to a valuer that some deduction should be made in respect of the inherent capabilities of the soil, he would compare the Act of 1883 with that of 1900, and he would see that Parliament had thought it right to eliminate the instruction as to taking the inherent capabilities of the soil into account from the latter Act. The valuer would conclude that, however much

he wished to, he was not entitled by his statutory instructions to have any regard for the inherent capabilities of the soil. This would injuriously affect the interests of landowners, and would cause grave injustice. In Northumberland there was an experimental farm managed by the county council, which had the great advantage of being directed and supervised by Professor Somerville. The result of the scientific teaching of this experimental farm showed that the application of half a ton of basic slag, which had cost the occupier 22s. per acre in the first three years, had given a live-weight increase per acre in the three years of 321 lb. of mutton, which, valued at 3¾d. per lb., was equivalent to an increase in value of £5. This was obtained at a total cost of 22s. If the valuer in this case did not consider himself obliged to have regard to the inherent capabilities of the soil, injustice and confiscation would be the result. Did they not suppose that the newspapers which represented the views of the extreme advocates of tenant right would point out that this proviso had been deliberately struck out by Parliament in order that the tenant might get the full value of the improvements without any deduction being made? There was every reason to believe that pressure would be brought to bear on the valuers not to have regard to the inherent capabilities of the soil. Not one Minister had expressed himself in favour of the policy that the valuer should not have regard to the inherent capabilities of the soil. Why, therefore, eliminate this provision which was in the Act of 1883? If it tended to preclude valuers from taking into consideration the inherent capabilities of the soil, Parliament would be making itself responsible for a policy of confiscation and injustice, and would be putting upon the Statute-book a germ of great future trouble.

Moved—

"In page 1, line 12, to add the following proviso:—'Provided always, that in estimating the value of any improvement in Schedule I., there shall not be taken into account, as part of the improvement made by the tenant, what is justly due to the inherent capabilities of the soil.'"—(*Earl Grey.*)

VISCOUNT CROSS: My Lords, I think it is necessary that your Lordships should know how these words were omitted when the Bill was drawn. This matter has been under the consideration of a great number of official bodies for some time past. The Central Chamber of Agriculture, as long ago as 1894, passed a resolution recommending the omission of this particular proviso from any Bill that was brought forward in the future. Then came the Royal Commission, which reported in 1898. The matter was discussed very fully before them, a considerable amount of evidence was taken, and they came to the unanimous conclusion that the proviso ought to be struck out. Although the Commission was formed of men of both parties, upon this particular question they were absolutely unanimous in their recommendation, and the proviso was struck out at the desire not only of the Central Chamber of Agriculture, but, I believe, of most of the chambers of agriculture throughout the country, backed up by the unanimous recommendation of the Royal Commission. Of course, your Lordships' action must be independent of what took place in the House of Commons; but it is worth while calling your attention to the fact that when this matter was discussed in the other House the majority in favour of leaving out the proviso, both in the Standing Committee and in the House itself, was of considerable dimensions. I do not think this ought to be argued as if the Bill in its present form would really take away from the landlord anything that he possesses or would be likely to get under a valuation, for Clause 1 of the Bill clearly states that—

"Where a tenant has made on his holding any improvement comprised in the First Schedule to this Act he shall, subject as in the Agricultural Holdings (England) Act, 1883 (in this Act referred to as the principal Act) and in this Act mentioned, be entitled, at the determination of a tenancy, on quitting his holding to obtain from the landlord as compensation under the said Acts for the improvement such sum as fairly represents the value of the improvement to an incoming tenant."

I do not suppose anyone would say that the inherent capabilities of the soil constituted an improvement made by the outgoing tenant. It is quite true that the words were inserted in the present Act; but if they are inoperative they are surplusage, and everything that is surplusage is bad. The "inherent capabilities of the soil" may mean anything or nothing. The proviso is spoken of in the evidence

given before the Royal Commission as one which nobody could understand. I do not say it is so myself, because I thoroughly understand what it means; but evidence was given as to the difficulty of interpreting the words "inherent capabilities of the soil." I leave it, of course, to your Lordships to decide whether the proviso should be inserted or not. There is no intention on the part of the Government of altering the law with regard to this matter. The words I have read seem to be absolutely conclusive.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: My Lords, I am glad to hear from the noble Viscount that the Board of Agriculture merely consider these words as surplusage, and that that is the reason why it is proposed to omit them from the Bill. But let me put the matter the other way. Admitting that these words are surplusage, why not leave them where they are? On the other hand, if they are any more than surplusage, and if the Secretary to the Board of Agriculture is right in his opinion, then the difference which will be made in the law will be a very serious one indeed. It must be borne in mind that the opinion of the gentleman who wrote the text-book that has been referred to, or the opinion of Mr. Long, is really of no importance whatever. What is of importance is the opinion of the arbitrators who are to interpret this Act. They will be guided by this first section, which is drawn in the widest possible terms, providing that the value of the improvement is "the value of the improvement to the incoming tenant." There could be nothing wider than that, and there is no limitation. When they look back to the present law they will find that there was a limitation, and that limitation Parliament has struck out. They will say to themselves, "Surely Parliament was not so foolish as to strike out this limitation if that striking out was to have no meaning whatever." I should like in one sentence just to explain to your Lordships clearly what they would be doing if they were to adjudge what was due to the tenant having regard to the "inherent capabilities of the soil." It has been said that when a man hires a farm he hires the farm with the inherent capabilities of the soil. Perfectly true; but for how long does he hire it? For the time during which he is to hold it; and when his tenancy of the land ceases, his tenancy of the "inherent capabilities of the soil" ceases. But what the valuer would do would be this: the tenant having enjoyed during the whole of his tenancy all that was due to the inherent capabilities of the soil, the valuer by his decision would adjudge him what proceeded from the inherent capabilities of the soil for, say—as in the case just mentioned—ten years after the tenancy ceased, a time during which the tenant has no right in the soil, and therefore no right to be paid for anything that accrues from it. In this way a great injustice would be done against the owner of the soil and in favour of the tenant. I very strongly hope that your Lordships will retain the words which are at present in the Act.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: I may be pardoned, perhaps, for saying a word on this question, because it happens that I was in office at the time the original Act was passed. I have not had time to go into the matter, but I believe I am right in saying that in our original Bill these words do not occur; they were introduced by an Amendment in the House of Commons.

VISCOUNT CROSS: That is so.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: I remember the discussion perfectly well, and I paid a great deal of attention to it. I suppose I am duller of apprehension than other people, but for the life of me I cannot, and never could, understand what the effect of these words could be, or what possible object they could serve. I have always thought that they are mere surplusage. They were assented to in order to avert possible opposition to the Bill which might have been dangerous, but in the opinion—I know—of those with whom I acted, the words were of no value whatever; and my opinion is that the sooner they go out of the Statute-book the better. There is only one use to which they can possibly be placed, and I do not see that that would benefit either the landlord or the tenant—that some unwary person may go to law in order to find out what they mean. I cannot conceive a prettier wrangle than would arise in such a case, but I pity the man who has to pay the costs. Speaking not only as a landlord, but as one keenly interested in the welfare of both landlord and

tenant, I heartily concur in the view that these words should not be retained.

THE DUKE OF NORTHUMBERLAND: I would like to point out to the noble Earl opposite that the important point is, not whether these words are surplusage, or whether they are necessary, or, indeed, whether they are intelligible. They appear to be perfectly intelligible to the Lord Privy Seal, and we have no reason to think that they are not intelligible to the valuers. The argument the noble Earl has just used might be perfectly sound if the words had not been in the original Act; but it is a very different thing when you take words like these out of the Act and leave the valuers to draw their own inferences from the omission. I am not here to contest what the Lord Privy Seal has said with regard to the interpretation of Clause 1. I dare say Clause 1, as it stands, in effect does embody all that these words include, but I am not so certain that the valuers, who have understood this Act, who have so far had no difficulty in administering the Act, will be as clear in drawing inferences as the noble Lord's long experience enables him to be. I hope the words will be re-inserted, in order to leave no room for doubt as to what the intention of Parliament is.

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE: I think the noble Viscount the Lord Privy Seal made it quite clear that Her Majesty's Government propose to leave it to the Committee to decide whether these words should remain or not. Personally, I am very much inclined to agree with the view taken by the noble Earl opposite, and although I quite admit that a great number of your Lordships are very well acquainted with these subjects and very competent to express an opinion upon them, still, I am not altogether inclined to ignore the authority of the unanimous opinion of the Royal Commission as well as that of the experts of the Board of Agriculture. It is stated in the Report of the Royal Commission that these words are unnecessary, and that they have given rise to misconception and misrepresentation on the part of some of the friends of the tenants; and I think it is probable that the Act would be improved if the words were omitted. However, as it is almost impossible to mistake what is the prevailing opinion upon this subject of the Committee as at present constituted, I scarcely think that it will be necessary to put the Committee to the trouble of dividing, as opinion appears to be so entirely in the opposite direction. Personally, as I have said, I should prefer that the words should have gone out, because I believe that it is important in the interests not only of the tenant, but of the landlord, that the tenant should not only possess, but know and feel confident that he possesses, full security for compensation for any outlay which he may embark upon in the performance of what are real improvements; and the insertion in the Act of any words which he cannot understand and nobody can explain to him is calculated to impair that confidence, and, therefore, to make him less willing to undertake improvements, and less anxious to do the best by the land either in his own interest or that of the landlord. For these reasons I regret that the Committee should take a view opposed to that of the Royal Commission and the experts of the Board, but, as it is clear that the great majority of your Lordships do not share in that regret, the Government, at any rate, do not propose to divide upon the question.

On Question, "That those words be there inserted," their Lordships divided: —Contents, 50; Not-Contents, 5.

CONTENTS.

Halsbury, E. (*L. Chancellor.*)
Devonshire, D. (*L. President.*)
Cross, V. (*L. Privy Seal.*)

Argyll, D.
Northumberland, D.

Bath, M.
Lansdowne, M.

Camperdown, E. [*Teller.*]
Clarendon, E.
Dartrey, E.
Denbigh, E.
Feversham, E.
Grey, E. [*Teller.*]
Harewood, E.
Ilchester, E.
Morley, E.
Onslow, E.
Powis, E.
Waldegrave, E.
Yarborough, E.

Falkland, V.
Falmouth, V.
Frankfort de Montmorency, V.
Portman, V.

Balfour, L.
Belper, L.
Brougham and Vaux, L.
Calthorpe, L.
Churchill, L.
Colchester, L.

Cottesloe, L.	Heneage, L.	Rowton, L.
De Mauley, L.	Kinnear, L.	Sherborne, L.
De Ramsey, L.	Lawrence, L.	Sudley, L. (*E. Arran*)
Fermanagh, L. (*E. Erne.*)	Manners of Haddon, L. (*M. Granby.*)	Ventry, L.
Glenesk, L.	Penrhyn, L.	Wemyss, L. (*E. Wemyss.*)
Harlech, L.	Raglan, L.	Wenlock, L.
Harris, L.		Windsor, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Kimberley, E.	Boyle, L. (*E. Cork and Orrery.*) [*Teller.*]	Cranworth, L.
Gordon, V. (*E. Aberdeen.*)		Ribblesdale, L. [*Teller.*]

VISCOUNT CROSS: The Amendment I now move is submitted in pursuance of an undertaking given by Mr. Long in the House of Commons to introduce words which should prevent the possibility of an unreasonable and excessive quantity of manure being required to be returned to the holding in respect of crops allowed to be sold off during the concluding years of the tenancy. It was suggested that the clause, which is admittedly required in favour of the landlord, might be utilised in that way, and it was considered proper to provide this safeguard.

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 27, after 'endured' insert 'not exceeding the value of the manure which would have been produced by the consumption on the holding of the crops so sold off or removed.'"—(*The Lord Privy Seal.*)

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN said this was a very peculiar Amendment, and its meaning was not very clear at first sight. Sub-section 4 as it stood provided that—

"In the ascertainment of the amount of the compensation payable to a tenant in respect of manures as defined by this Act, there shall be taken into account the value of the manure required by the contract of tenancy or by custom to be returned to the holding in respect of any crops sold off or removed from the holding within the last two years of the tenancy or other less time for which the tenancy has endured."

That was a very ordinary contract in the case of any farm near a town, and, apart from contract, was an arrangement imposed by custom. But if the words proposed by this Amendment were inserted it would be necessary to enter into two calculations—(1) how much crop had been sold off the land, and (2) how much manure that crop would have produced; and, if that amount of manure exceeded by one cow-pat the proper amount, the difference was to be taken into account in calculating the compensation. This interference with the arrangement come to under contract or existing by custom was quite unreasonable; it would be much better to cut out all reference to custom and contract altogether than to limit it in this absurd way.

On Question, "That those words be there inserted," agreed to.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 2:—

Drafting Amendments made.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN said that the object of the new sub-section he rose to move was very simple—namely, that the present practice with regard to notices of claim should be continued. It might be asked how it was that the provisions he now proposed, which were in the original Act, had come to be dropped out. It happened that the Bill omitted Sections 6 to 16 of the principal Act, and these provisions were contained in one of the sub-sections omitted. As the Bill stood, it would not be necessary for the tenant to give any details of any kind in making his claim, or for the landlord to give particulars of the deductions he claimed under Sub-section 3. It was surely for the general convenience that the old practice should continue of requiring detailed particulars to be given.

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 40, after 'claim' to insert a new sub-section: 'Every claim and written notice under this section shall state, as far as reasonably may be, the particulars and amount of the intended claim.'"—(*The Earl of Camperdown.*)

VISCOUNT CROSS explained that the unanimous opinion of the Royal Commission was that notices of claim should be done away with, it having been found that they were inconvenient, and led to trouble and expense. The noble Earl need not be afraid of particulars not being

given, because, under the Bill as it stood, if anyone unreasonably refused to give particulars he would be subject to costs at the discretion of the valuer.

Amendment negatived.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 3, 4, and 5 agreed to.

Clause 6 :—

THE DUKE OF NORTHUMBERLAND, in moving the rejection of this clause, said he would find it easier to give reasons for its rejection if he had heard any reasons for its being in the Bill at all. This legislation, their Lordships were aware, was an interference with freedom of conduct; that was the avowed object; but in addition to that it was also giving the tenant by a sidewind a great amount of fixity of tenure. As the law stood, landlords were necessarily very cautious of doing anything which would induce the tenant to leave his holding, because of the trouble and expense involved; but why should the Legislature do away with any protection which the landlord now had against any act of the tenant which might be detrimental to the holding, without taking the extreme measure of determining the tenancy? It was very questionable whether penal rents were really legal. The law as it stood gave ample protection to the tenant against anything unfair in the way of penal rents. Why should there be a still further limitation of the right of the landlord to prevent improper cropping or other bad treatment of his land, when the Bill already went far enough in restricting the landlord's enjoyment of his property? True, it was provided that this section should not apply to any covenant or condition against breaking up permanent pasture and other matters, but there were other matters besides those enumerated in that proviso which were properly the subject of penalties in case the tenant transgressed the terms of his lease.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out Clause 6."—(*The Duke of Northumberland.*)

VISCOUNT CROSS said that in a limited number of cases provisions were inserted in the lease requiring the payment of penalties or liquidated damages for acts which were not all likely to result in an equivalent amount of loss to the landlord. These penal clauses were certainly not looked upon with favour by the courts, and there was often great difficulty in enforcing them. It was considered that a better feeling would be brought about between landlord and tenant if these penal clauses were done away with, except in those very special cases where the injury to the landlord might be a very serious matter.

THE DUKE OF NORTHUMBERLAND pointed out that at present the landlord had a legal and an equitable remedy; he might take his complaint against the tenant before a court of law or before an arbitrator. If it were true that the courts "did not look with favour" on these clauses, there was still less reason for depriving the landlord of his legal rights.

*LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH expressed the opinion that these penal clauses were extremely disadvantageous in a lease, and, in his experience (not now a very short one), they were very rarely enforced. He believed the chief result of piling up clauses providing large damages for the landlord was only to produce irritation and ill-feeling, and in estates under enlightened management they were now being generally dropped. With the power of making a counterclaim provided for in this Bill, the landlord had ample opportunity of protecting himself. This clause would only put into general application the practice which was already adopted in the great majority of instances.

Amendment negatived.

Clauses 6, 7, 8, and 9 agreed to.

Clause 10 :—

*LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH moved the insertion of a new sub-section, proposed at the instance of the Scottish Office, and accepted by the noble Viscount in charge of the Bill, the object of which was to clear up a doubt that had been expressed as to the competency of an appeal in certain cases from the decision of a sheriff-substitute to a sheriff. In the cases with which this clause dealt, the sheriff-substitute was really acting instead of the sheriff, and clearly, if an

appeal should lie at all, it should be not to the sheriff, but to a higher court. The sub-section he now moved would avoid any risk of additional and unnecessary legal procedure being introduced.

Amendment moved—

"In page 5, at end of clause to insert: '(5) Where any jurisdiction committed by the principal Act or this Act to the sheriff is exercised by the sheriff-substitute there shall be no appeal to the sheriff.'"—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Remaining clauses agreed to.

First Schedule:—

*LORD WINDSOR moved the first of three Amendments applying to items (4) (6) and (11) of Part I. of this schedule. This part enumerated among the improvements to which the consent of the landlord was required—

"(4) Making and planting of osier beds (exceeding one acre).
"(6) Making of gardens (exceeding one acre).
"(11) Planting of orchards or fruit-bushes (exceeding one acre)."

He proposed to omit the words "exceeding one acre" in each instance. As the Bill stood it was not quite clear whether the intentions that a tenant farmer should only be able to deal with one acre of land, and must choose which of the three objects he would devote that one acre to, or whether he was at liberty to devote three acres to these three special objects. As he read the Bill, he saw nothing in the way of the latter course. But, apart from the doubt as to the effect of the provision, he maintained that this was introducing a new and wholly indefensible principle. In the other House a similar Amendment to the present was proposed, and the Government had admitted that, logically, this portion of the schedule could not be defended; but the President of the Board of Agriculture said that farmers fully realised why the distinction of one acre should be drawn. On a large farm no great harm would be done by devoting one or even three acres to these purposes, but in the case of a small farm it might be a very serious matter indeed. Take the case of a twenty-acre farm, with several changes of tenancy within ten years; if each tenant exercised his rights under this schedule, that small farm might in the course of ten years become converted into a chess-board of osier beds and gardens and orchards. And the landlord was not only to be compelled to suffer this, but he was to be liable for compensation as well. There was also this possibility: the present Government thought it right to fix a limit of one acre, but another Government, holding very different views, might extend the principle and allow five or ten acres to be devoted to these purposes. This was no doubt the "thin end of the wedge" argument, and there was generally about that argument the weakness that it relied upon prophecy; but it happened that in the House of Commons, where a similar Amendment had been moved, and opposed by the Government, the wedge had been immediately driven home against them. After the President of the Board of Agriculture had defeated an Amendment similar to the present one, a Member for a Scottish constituency got up and moved that the tenant farmer should be permitted to redeem not exceeding one acre of waste land. The President of the Board of Agriculture was reduced to using exactly the same argument that had been used against him five minutes before in order to defend himself against this very severe hitting of the wedge which he himself had just inserted. That Amendment was defeated; but it was very difficult to see why, if a tenant farmer could use an acre for the making of an orchard or a garden, or planting an osier bed, he should not be allowed to reclaim an acre of waste land. He could not see how this provision could be defended, and he did not believe it was supported except by those who desired dual ownership of the land. He appealed to the Government to remove this blot from the Bill.

Amendment moved—

"In page 6, line 8, to omit the words 'exceeding one acre.'"—(*Lord Windsor.*)

VISCOUNT CROSS said that, as he understood the effect of the schedule, only one acre would be liable to be applied to each of these objects. This proposal was embodied in the Report of the Central Chamber of Agriculture so long ago as 1894, and he

found that present at the meeting of that body, and agreeing with that Report were Mr. Chaplin, Mr. Jeffreys, Mr. Clare Sewell Read, and others, and that the Committee consisted of members of both political parties. A proposal to give tenant farmers right to compensation in respect of orchards and trees, irrespective of size, was rejected by the Committee, and this limited provision was agreed upon, the object being to encourage small gardens and things of that kind. The proposal was again considered by the Royal Commission of 1893, the members of which were Lord Cobham, Mr. Chaplin, Mr. Long, the late Mr. Little, and Sir John Gilmour, and they unanimously endorsed the proposal. With respect to the argument of the noble Lord who moved the Amendment, that in the course of ten years the whole holding might be turned into an orchard or an osier bed, the answer was that the only compensation the tenant could claim was the value of his improvement "to the incoming tenant." That would be in practice sufficient protection against a tenant applying any considerable part of his holding to purposes which would have no value to the tenant who would succeed him. There was no ulterior object whatever in inserting these three lines in this part of the Schedule, and he hoped their Lordships would retain them.

THE EARL OF FEVERSHAM contended that too much attention should not be paid to decisions arrived at by the Central Chamber of Agriculture or any other public bodies; the business of the Legislature was to do justice as between landlord and tenant. The question here was whether this change in the law was fair and just. He held that its immediate effect would be injurious. In the case of small farms (of which there were many in the north of England) the power of devoting an acre of the holding to an orchard or an osier bed, or a garden, although it might be an immediate advantage to the tenant, would mean a serious injury to the farm; and with a succession of tenants thinking only of their immediate advantage, the farm might be diverted altogether from its original and proper purpose. He agreed that this was the "thin end of the wedge"—it was a step towards dual ownership. There had been in the sister isle warning sufficient of the danger of that principle. He cordially supported the Amendment.

LORD HENEAGE pointed out that, as the words stood in the Second Schedule, a tenant could plant "any number" of osier beds, fruit gardens, etc., on a farm, so long as none of them exceeded three-quarters of an acre, or were under an acre. So that it would not require successive tenants to plant a dozen orchards or a dozen osier beds on a farm.

VISCOUNT CROSS: But the consent of the landlord must be given to anything over an acre.

LORD HENEAGE: I beg my noble friend's pardon. Under the words of the Bill, as drafted, there is nothing to prevent the tenant, without applying to the landlord at all, planting a dozen osier beds, providing that none of them exceeds one acre. It may be a mistake in the drafting, but that is the effect of the words as they stand.

On Question, whether the words proposed to be left out shall stand part of the schedule, their Lordships divided:—Contents, 15; Not-Contents, 25.

CONTENTS.

Devonshire, D. (*L. President.*)
Cross, V. (*L. Privy Seal.*)

Clarendon, E.
Denbigh, E.
Morley, E.

Onslow, E.
Vane, E. (*M. Londonderry.*)
Waldegrave, E. [*Teller.*]
Frankfort de Montmorency, V.

Ashbourne, L.

Balfour, L.
Belper, L.
Churchill, L. [*Teller.*]
Harris, L.
Lawrence, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Northumberland, D.

Camperdown, E.
Dartrey, E.
Feversham, E.
Grey, E.

Ilchester, E.
Powis, E.

Falkland, V.
Falmouth, V.

Brougham and Vaux, L.

Calthorpe, L.
Colchester, L.
De Mauley, L.
De Ramsey, L.
Fermanagh, L. (*E. Erne.*)
Heneage, L. [*Teller.*]

Manners of Haddon, L. (*M. Granby.*)	Raglan, L.	Sudley, L. (*E. Arran.*)
Penrhyn, L.	Rowton, L.	Ventry, L.
	Stewart of Garlies, L. (*E. Galloway.*)	Wemyss, L. (*E. Wemyss.*)
		Windsor, L. [*Teller.*]

Schedule, as amended, agreed to.

Second and third schedules amended and agreed to.

Bill re-committed to the Standing Committee, and to be printed as amended. (No. 211.)

House adjourned during pleasure; and resumed by the Earl of Morley.

TITHE RENT-CHARGE (IRELAND) BILL.

Read 3ª (according to Order), with the Amendments; further Amendments made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES ACT (1890) AMENDMENT BILL.

Read 3ª (according to Order), with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

OIL IN TOBACCO BILL.

House in Committee (according to Order); an Amendment made; Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendment to be received on Monday next.

House adjourned at five minutes past Eight of the clock, to Monday next, half-past Eleven of the clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 27th July, 1900.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

ABERDEEN CORPORATION TRAMWAYS BILL.

GREAT WESTERN RAILWAY BILL.

LONDON AND SOUTH WESTERN RAILWAY BILL.

SOUTH METROPOLITAN GAS BILL.

Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

CRYSTAL PALACE COMPANY BILL [Lords].

ROE'S PATENT BILL [Lords].

Read the third time, and passed, without amendment.

SOUTH SHIELDS CORPORATION BILL [Lords].

Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

WALSALL CORPORATION BILL [Lords].

As amended, considered.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

TRAMWAYS ORDERS CONFIRMATION (No. 2) BILL [Lords].

Reported, without amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Bill to be considered upon Monday next.

CALEDONIAN RAILWAY BILL [Lords].

MORLEY CORPORATION BILL [Lords].

BOURNEMOUTH CORPORATION BILL [Lords].

Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

MANCHESTER CORPORATION TRAMWAYS BILL [Lords].

Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill, Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 14) Bill, Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill, Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill, Perth and Paisley Gas Provisional Orders Bill, without amendment.

That they have agreed to—Bradford Corporation Bill, Halifax Corporation Bill, Oldham Corporation Bill, Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill, City of London (Various Powers) Bill, Market Weighton Drainage and Navigation Bill,

Cumberland County Council (Bridges) Bill, Charing Cross and Strand Electricity Supply Bill, Croydon Tramways and Improvements Bill, with Amendments.

That they have agreed to Amendments to—London Sea Water Supply Bill [Lords], Glasgow Building Regulations Bill, [Lords], Motherwell and Bellshill Railway Bill [Lords], North Eastern Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill [Lords], Rotherham Corporation Bill [Lords], without amendment.

That they have passed a Bill intituled, "An Act for amalgamating the Waterford, Limerick, and Western Railway Company with the Great Southern and Western Railway Company; and for other purposes." Great Southern and Western and Waterford, Limerick, and Western Railway Companies Amalgamation Bill [Lords].

And also a Bill intituled, "An Act for amalgamating the Undertaking of the Waterford and Central Ireland Railway Company with the Great Southern and Western Railway Company; and for other purposes." Great Southern and Western and Waterford and Central Ireland Railway Companies Amalgamation Bill [Lords].

GREAT SOUTHERN AND WESTERN AND WATERFORD, LIMERICK, AND WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANIES AMALGAMATION BILL [Lords].

GREAT SOUTHERN AND WESTERN AND WATERFORD AND CENTRAL IRELAND RAILWAY COMPANIES AMALGAMATION BILL [Lords].

Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Whithorn, against; to lie upon the Table.

EVENING CONTINUATION SCHOOLS.

Petition of the School Board for London, for greater facilities for the attendance of young people; to lie upon the Table.

INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS BILL.

Petitions from Leith, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

INEBRIATES' RETREATS (RULES FOR MANAGEMENT).

Copy presented, of Regulations, made with the approval of the Secretary of State for the Home Department, for the Domestic Management of Corngreaves Hall Retreat, licensed as a Retreat under the Inebriates Acts, 1869 to 1899 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

IRISH LAND COMMISSION (PURCHASE OF LAND (IRELAND) ACT, 1891).

Copy presented, of Return of Advances under the Act during the year ended 31st March, 1900 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 302.]

CHINA (No. 3, 1900).

Copy presented, of Correspondence respecting the Insurrectionary Movement in China [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 2488 and 2490 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PAPERS LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

1. Chamber of London.—Annual Accounts of the Chamberlain of London for the year 1899 [by Act]; to be printed. [No. 303.]

2. Royal University of Ireland.—Copy of Account of Receipts and Expenditure of the Royal University of Ireland for the year ended 31st March, 1900, together with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon [by Act]; to be printed. [No. 304.]

QUESTIONS.

CHINA—ANTI-FOREIGN OUTBREAK—RECENT NEWS—ADVANCE OF THE ALLIES ON PEKING.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): I beg to ask the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs whether there is any news from China.

*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr.

BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): No, Sir; we have no further news at the Foreign Office; but I may, in answer to the right hon. Gentleman, allude to one question which is on the Paper—namely, as to whether the advance on Peking has yet begun. The commanding officer has not yet been able to advance, but preparations seemed to be far advanced towards completion.

CHINESE EMBASSY IN LONDON.

MR. WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he can state how long the Emperor of China is to be represented by a Minister in London, while Her Majesty is practically unrepresented in China owing to communications with her Minister being interrupted by the neglect of the Chinese Government to keep communications open.

*MR. BRODRICK: The present situation in China is difficult and complicated, and while our information is imperfect I cannot make any statement in reply to the inquiry of the hon. Member.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR — HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL ARRANGEMENTS INQUIRY.

SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if the South African Hospitals Commission will be able to inquire into the insanitary conditions which led to the outbreak of enteric fever and the consequent overcrowding of the hospitals at Bloemfontein.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): It will rest with the Commission themselves to determine the scope of their reference, but my own impression is that if the insanitary condition was due to the neglect of the Medical Department it would undoubtedly come under the cognisance of the Commission. If, on the other hand, it was due to military necessities—as, for instance, to the insanitary condition of the camp following on Paardeberg—I imagine it would not come under the survey of the Commission; but that is my own personal impression.

SIR WALTER FOSTER: Is it not difficult to come to a conclusion of that kind without some inquiry?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It rests with the Commission to interpret their own reference.

KOORNSPRUIT DISASTER.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether Colonel Broadwood, who was in command of the column at Koornspruit, was informed that the infantry post at the waterworks had been removed by order from Lord Roberts's headquarters, and whether he has any official reports showing that the movements of Colonel Broadwood's column were determined by the belief that there was a fortified infantry post on which to fall back; and will he state who is the officer responsible for failure to communicate to Colonel Broadwood the fact that the infantry post was about to be removed.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not think it would be desirable to debate in the House these details of military operations, still less by way of question and answer.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Is the right hon. Gentleman not aware, although he does not read the newspapers, that the name of the officer has been bruited about for months past? It is not fair to other officers.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

RESUMPTION OF INDUSTRIAL OCCUPATIONS AT JOHANNESBURG.

MR. KIMBER (Wandsworth): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the prohibition by Lord Roberts and Sir Alfred Milner against the return to Johannesburg is intended to apply to every person without exception; and, in particular, does it apply to such as engineers and owners of industrial works in Johannesburg, which during the war have had to be left in charge of Boers, or shut down, and the re-opening of which would be for the advantage of the military and community there and the re-settlement of the country, such as, for example, the steam laundry at Johannesburg, which belongs to two Englishmen, who wish to proceed thither, and is at present in custody of a Boer woman, and other similar cases.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): The resumption of

trade and industry will not be delayed a moment longer than the military exigencies require, and such persons as managers and engineers will be naturally allowed to go up in anticipation of the general population to make arrangements for re-establishing the industries of the place. But I learn on 6th July that up to that date Lord Roberts had only been able to allow the return of twenty mining representatives, and that these were still detained *en route*.

MARTIAL LAW IN CAPE COLONY AND RHODESIA.

CAPTAIN SINCLAIR (Forfarshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can state in what districts or areas of British South Africa is martial law now in force, and upon what dates was it so proclaimed in these districts or areas.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I have to refer to my answer on the 2nd April to the hon. Member for the Rushcliffe Division of Nottinghamshire, and of yesterday to the hon. Member for Montgomeryshire.* I have only to add that on 15th May martial law was proclaimed to be in force throughout all the districts of Southern Rhodesia.

LINDLEY DISASTER.

MR. KIMBER: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if he can state when and where the inquiry, which it is understood the Queen's Regulations require to be held in cases of capture or surrender of British troops, will probably be held in the case of the 13th Imperial Yeomanry at Lindley.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): No inquiry can be held until the prisoners are released.

BRITISH CASUALTIES IN JUNE.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War what has been the loss by casualties, sickness, and the capture and surrender of British forces in South Africa during the month of June, after the announcement that the war was practically over.

MR. WYNDHAM: I know nothing of the announcement referred to at the end of the question. The total losses, including all deaths in South Africa, and men missing and taken prisoners, during the month of June, amount approximately to 102 officers and 2,714 men.

BRITISH MEDICAL COMFORTS FOR THE BOERS — TREATMENT OF BRITISH PRISONERS.

MR. KIMBER: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether he has any information to the effect that the Boers while still in arms and actual fight with British troops were allowed to send in to Ficksburg for medical comforts, and that these were supplied from British Army stores, whilst British prisoners of war at Nooitgedacht have not been allowed to receive either medical comforts, clothing, or even to receive and transmit letters to their relatives; and whether he has yet succeeded in procuring any alleviation of these conditions.

MR. WYNDHAM: In regard to the medical assistance to the enemy at Ficksburg no report has reached the War Office. In regard to the British prisoners of war at Nooitgedacht the Government is making every effort to secure that supplies of medical comforts and clothing and correspondence shall reach them, and is most anxious to co-operate with any private effort in this direction. It is considered that private effort is likely to prove more efficacious. It must be remembered that there are difficulties at the present time in the way of communicating with the Boer Government. A telegram was, however, despatched to Lord Roberts on the 24th instant urging him to bring pressure to bear on the Boer authorities in regard to the treatment of the prisoners.

ARMY MEDICAL DEPARTMENT—CIVIL SURGEONS—SUPPOSED PLEDGE OF SECRECY.

DR. TANNER (Cork County, Mid): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if Lord Roberts has been asked by the War Office whether civil surgeons employed in South Africa have been required to sign a contract in which they undertook not to divulge in any way their opinions on hospital efficiency or the reverse; and, if so, can he say when did

* See *The Parliamentary Debates* [Fourth Series], Vol. lxxxi., page 934; and the present volume, page 1301.

the War Office ask this question of Lord Roberts, and whether by post or telegraph, and when may an answer be expected.

MR. WYNDHAM: As I stated yesterday to the House, Lord Roberts has been asked this question by telegraph, but no reply has as yet been received.

DR. TANNER: When do you expect one?

[No answer was given.]

RETIRED ARMY MEDICAL OFFICERS RECALLED TO ACTIVE SERVICE.

DR. TANNER: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if he can state why the medical officers liable to recall were not ordered to rejoin instead of being asked individually to volunteer for duty in the military hospitals in South Africa, and if the War Office will take steps to bring the matter under the consideration of the Commission.

MR. WYNDHAM: As I stated on the 13th instant, in reply to a question by the Member for South Donegal, there are ninety-eight officers liable to recall; of these eighteen hold permanent appointments under the War Office and twenty-five have been employed during the war. The reason why the remainder were not called up is that it was thought better to employ civilian surgeons who have more recent experience.

COMMAND OF THE ROYAL IRISH RIFLES.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether a gentleman from another regiment has been appointed to the command in the Royal Irish Rifles rendered vacant by the death of Colonel Eager, who died from wounds in the Natal campaign; and what explanation, if any, has the War Office to offer for the passing over of the officers of the Royal Irish Rifles who fought in that campaign.

MR. WYNDHAM: The reply to the first paragraph is in the affirmative. As regards the second paragraph I have on a previous occasion endeavoured to make clear to the hon. Member that the selection of such commanding officers is made by the Commander-in-Chief and the Army Board.

BRITISH REVERSES—COURTS OF INQUIRY.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if he will state how many officers and men were captured or surrendered at Nicholson's Nek, Koorn Spruit, Reddersburg, Lindley, Roodeval, and between Roodeval and Heilbron, and how many have been released from captivity; have the courts of inquiry prescribed by the Queen's Regulations to be held by the general officer commanding to investigate the circumstances under which the capture or surrender took place been held in the case of any other officers or men who were captured or surrendered on any of these occasions; and, if so, in what instances; and have the opinions of the court as to the circumstances under which those captures or surrenders have taken place been, in accordance with the Queen's Regulations, forwarded to the War Office; and, if so, on what grounds have they been withheld from the public.

MR. WYNDHAM: The hon. Member will find all the information which can be given in reply to the first paragraph in the published weekly report of the casualties. In reply to the remainder of the question, no detailed information as to the courts of inquiry has reached the War Office.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Have those inquiries been held or not?

MR. WYNDHAM: I cannot say that as a matter of fact, because I have not received the report.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Does the hon. Gentleman not know that the officers who have been imprisoned and released are now on active service, and is it possible without inquiry for them to be replaced on active service?

MR. WYNDHAM: In the absence of a report I cannot reply on the question of fact. I think it would be wasting the time of the House to indulge in speculative surmises.

IMPERIAL YEOMANRY ENCAMPMENT NEAR BEIRA.

SIR J. FERGUSSON (Manchester, N.E.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if the Secretary of State has received a report of the encampment

of two Imperial Yeomanry battalions for three weeks in an unhealthy spot near Beira after their disembarkation, whereby widespread fever and dysentery were contracted, and many deaths occurred; whether, with one exception, all the officers were prostrated, and a number of horses died; and whether the Commission will inquire into the circumstances.

MR. WYNDHAM: A report of the detention of Yeomanry at Bamboo Creek and of mortality amongst the animals reached the War Office in May. A telegram was despatched to Sir F. Carrington calling for a full report. This has not yet been received.

GRATUITIES TO VOLUNTEER OFFICERS SERVING IN SOUTH AFRICA.

MR. J. A. PEASE (Northumberland, Tyneside): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether, according to the Queen's Regulations, all Militia officers whose regiments have been embodied, and who serve in the war in South Africa, will receive £100 apiece at the termination of the war; and, if so, whether it is the intention of the Government to give a gratuity of £100 to those Volunteer officers who have served in South Africa when peace is concluded.

MR. WYNDHAM: Yes, Sir. The gratuities are issuable to both Militia and Volunteer officers under the Pay Warrant.

VOLUNTEERS—EMPLOYMENT ON FOREIGN SERVICE.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if, without dividing the Volunteer force in time of peace into two classes, namely, those willing to serve in any part of the world if called upon and those willing to serve only in Great Britain, power can be taken in the Volunteers Bill to enable the services of Volunteers to be accepted for service in any portion of the world whenever Her Majesty's military or naval forces are engaged in actual operations of war.

MR. WYNDHAM: I fear it will not be possible to re-open this subject in connection with the Volunteers Bill, which has passed through Committee.

GIBRALTAR GARRISON—OFFICERS' HOUSES.

MR. PIERPOINT (Warrington): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether any steps have been taken, and, if so, what, to provide houses at reasonable rents for officers of the garrison at Gibraltar.

MR. WYNDHAM: The question has been under the consideration of a Committee which went to Gibraltar and has reported in favour of some such provision. The further questions of construction and of the rent chargeable are now under consideration.

ARMY PROMOTION BOARD.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if he will state who are the members of the Army Promotion Board; by whom are they appointed to seats on this Board; what is the tenure of their office, and do they hold office at the pleasure of the Secretary of State for War, or of the Commander-in-Chief, or either of them; what are the duties of this Board; and when recommendations are made of gentlemen from other regiments to assume the commands held by men who have fallen in active service or become incapacitated from wounds, is a memorandum of the reasons for passing over the officers of the regiments in which such vacancies have occurred prepared in the War Office.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Promotion Board consists of the generals commanding in Ireland, at Aldershot, and either at Portsmouth or Devonport. These officers sit during the term of their appointment to their districts. Other officers, appointed by the Commander-in-Chief, are added to their number to deal with the particular arms of the service. A record is kept of the Board's recommendations.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: The hon. Gentleman has not told me the names of the members of this Board of Patronage.

MR. WYNDHAM: I do not think any useful purpose would be served by giving the names of the officers.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: That is a matter for the country, and not for you.

GUN FATALITY AT CAMDEN FORT, CORK.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War, in reference to the inquest upon the body of Gunner John Addis, killed at Camden Fort, Cork, by the bursting of the breech of a 40-pounder gun on the 15th instant, whether he is aware that Captain Ord, Gunnery Inspector, stated at the inquest that an accident occurred about five years ago and the breech was blown away; and that the Record-book of the Ordnance authorities shows that the gun in question was examined in 1899 and reported as having a fissure in the vent; and can he state whether an Artillery Militiaman engaged upon artillery practice is in the same position as regards War Office regulations as an artilleryman of the Regular forces engaged on active service, and will the War Office authorities give any compensation to the relatives of the deceased if it should be proved that his death was occasioned by a defect in the gun.

MR. WYNDHAM: I informed the hon. Member yesterday that a report was expected upon this subject. When that report has been received and considered, I shall be ready to enter upon the questions he raises.

MR. FLYNN: If the inquiry is shown to be due to the fault of the War Office, would that not place the case on a different footing?

MR. WYNDHAM: That does not enter into the question. If the injury is incurred in the service, it does not matter whether it is the fault of the War Office or not.

MILITIA OFFICERS' PAY.

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, S.E.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether officers on retired pay holding commissions in Militia will be allowed to draw retired pay as well as the pay of their rank in Militia during embodiment.

MR. WYNDHAM: No, Sir; except for a period equivalent to the period of annual training.

GREAT YARMOUTH FISHERMEN AND THE MILITIA.

*SIR J. COLOMB (Great Yarmouth): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that difficulties are anticipated at Great Yarmouth and elsewhere during the coming fishery season owing to many fishermen and employees in the fish-curing business being out for service with the Militia, and whether, where possible, furlough will be granted to such men during the fishery season so as to mitigate as far as possible injury to the fishing industry.

MR. WYNDHAM: As I have already explained to the House, instructions have been issued to the districts that Militiamen belonging to units embodied prior to March might be given furlough if they had satisfactorily completed their training and could be spared.

*SIR J. COLOMB: Will that apply to all men?

MR. WYNDHAM: To all men of good character.

MILITIA SERGEANT-MAJORS.

MAJOR RASCH: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if he can state when sergeant-majors of Militia battalions are to receive warrant rank; and whether a colour sergeant and two sergeants are to be attached to each company as permanent staff.

MR. WYNDHAM: The warrant was signed on the 26th July. The reply to the second part of the question is in the negative.

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS — IRISH TENDERERS.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether it is the intention of the Government to provide a depôt in Dublin for the accommodation of Irish merchants and manufacturers who are desirous to tender for supplies and fulfil contracts for Ireland.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Mr. J. POWELL-WILLIAMS, Birmingham, S.): No, Sir; the small advantages which might be derived from the establishment of a depôt in Dublin would in no way compensate for the expenditure which it would necessarily involve.

THE "VICTORIA AND ALBERT."

SIR EDWARD GOURLEY (Sunderland): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if he can state how many tons of silicate cotton were used in packing the bulkheads and casings of the new Royal yacht "Victoria and Albert"; has this padding been removed; if so, what substitute is to be employed for the purpose of keeping the vessel cool; will he state how many tons of brass there were in the saloon and cabin sidelights, and whether all or part of these fittings have been removed; and will he also say when all the additional cast-iron ballast which is being fitted will be completed, and the number of tons.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. GOSCHEN, St. George's, Hanover Square): Forty-nine tons of silicate cotton have been removed from the Royal yacht. The portion of this that was between the bulkheads and overhead was introduced not for the purpose of keeping the vessel cool, but with the idea of deadening sound. Experiments were carried out during the passage round from Pembroke to ascertain whether the silicate cotton on funnel casings and over the engine room was really required for the purpose of keeping the ship cool, and where it could be dispensed with. Either silicate cotton or mica lagging has been retained wherever it was found to be necessary for this purpose, and its removal in other places has enabled the ventilation of the lower deck to be improved. Great care has been taken not to interfere with the comfort of the ship in the slightest degree. Wooden shutters have been substituted for the brass shutters that were fitted to the windows of the pavilion, causing a saving of weight of about five tons, but none of the brass cabin side-lights have been removed. The exact quantity of ballast required cannot be stated until the ship has been inclined, which will be done shortly. It will probably not be more than 150 tons. A large portion of this is already in place.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): Does the right hon. Gentleman expect that when these alterations are completed the vessel will be able to stand up in the water?

THE BELLEVILLE BOILER INQUIRY.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty will the terms of reference to the proposed Committee on Belleville Boilers enable the Committee to investigate the circumstances under which these boilers were first adopted by the Admiralty; to ascertain under whose advice they were thus adopted; and to examine the persons who gave that advice in such a manner as will enable those persons to explain the grounds on which the advice was given.

MR. GOSCHEN: If my hon. friend will recall what I said with reference to the proposed constitution of the Committee and the object of the inquiry, he will see that such an investigation as he suggests in his question was not contemplated.

ROMAN CATHOLIC CHAPLAINS IN THE NAVY.

CAPTAIN DONELAN (Cork, E.): On behalf of my hon. friend, the Member for East Clare, I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if he can state what steps have been taken to furnish the Navy with Roman Catholic chaplains.

MR. GOSCHEN: There are certain proposals from Cardinal Vaughan under consideration. In other respects I must refer the hon. Member to many previous statements on the subject.

TORPEDO BOATS AT THE NAVAL MANŒUVRES.

SIR EDWARD GOURLEY: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if he will be good enough to state the age, speed, and length of coal endurance at sea of the twenty-four torpedo boats which, in the current naval manœuvres, are being pitted against twenty-four modern torpedo boat destroyers, and whether the torpedo boats located in the French Channel ports are not only nearly double in number to those located in British Channel ports, but also more modern and of greater speed; and will he state whether the manœuvring squadrons are being replenished with fuel at sea or by returing to port, and whether they are accompanied by repairing and condensing ships; and, if not, can he state the reason, seeing that both descriptions would be needed in war.

MR. GOSCHEN: The question of the hon. Member comprises matters of statistics and naval policy, with which it is impossible to deal within the limits of a question. The hon. Gentleman will find statistics as to British and foreign torpedo boats in the Return of fleets presented to the House last year. The contending admirals have colliers at their disposal for coaling their squadrons when and where they wish. A condensing ship has been attached to each of A and B fleets for the manœuvres. Except the "Hecla," which ship is capable of effecting small repairs, no repairing ships are taking part in the manœuvres. The provision of such ships for the short period of the manœuvres was unnecessary, and their fitting would have been very costly. I may remind the hon. Gentleman that provision was made in the additional Estimates for a repairing ship for general service with the fleet, but the arrangements have not yet been concluded.

NATIONAL COAL RESERVE.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if his attention has been called to the rise in the price of coal and the difficulties it will entail if long maintained upon many British industries, as also the suffering it will cause to the poor in winter; whether he has any official information to show that this result has been brought about by the increase in the purchases of coal by foreign competition, or by the laying in of stocks by foreign navies; and whether he proposes to take any steps in the matter in the interests of the home population, and of the defensive requirements of the United Kingdom.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): The price of coal exported in the first half of 1900 is considerably higher than in the year 1899, but not so high as in 1873, the figures being 15·87s. in 1900, 10·71s. in 1899, and 20·90s. in 1873. It is not practicable to apportion the recent rise in price among the various causes which have contributed thereto. With regard to the last question, the Government, while alive to the considerations referred to by my hon. friend, are not prepared at present to make any proposals to Parliament in the direction indicated by my hon. and gallant friend.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: Will the right hon. Gentleman state to what countries the coal exported mainly goes?

MR. RITCHIE: I shall be glad to inform my hon. and gallant friend if he will put down a question on the subject.

IMPORTATION OF DOGS INTO GREAT BRITAIN.

MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether he has considered the inconvenience caused by the present stringent regulations as to the bringing back into the United Kingdom of dogs temporarily removed abroad by their owners; whether he is aware that some of these persons are invalids who dislike being separated from their dogs, and in some cases have been prevented from going abroad for their health by the anxiety and annoyance of the regulations, and because they are unwilling to be parted from pets; whether he is aware that, in some cases, persons who have brought dogs back are unable to comply with the regulation that the dogs should be kept in the same house for six months, owing to having let their own houses or to inability to remain in the same place; and whether, seeing that some of these persons have been subjected to prosecution and conviction for failing to comply with the regulations from causes thus beyond their control, and having regard to the anxiety and loss of time and money thus caused, he will substitute, in the case of dogs who have been taken by their owners from this country and are being brought back from abroad, simple regulations requiring notice to be given of changes of residence and periodical inspection by official veterinary surgeons, with any necessary penalties for evasion.

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. AKERS DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): My right hon. friend desires me to say that the question of the admission into Great Britain of dogs brought from abroad has been very fully considered from the various points of view to which the hon. Member refers. My right hon. friend does not consider that in practice the adoption of the suggestion made in the question would be found to afford the necessary measure of security against the reintroduction of

rabies, but the practice of the Department with regard to the issue of licences has recently been somewhat modified, and perhaps the hon. Member will submit to my right hon. friend for further consideration particulars of any individual cases which may have been brought under his notice and in which he thinks that any cause for complaint exists.

PALACE OF WESTMINSTER—VENTILATION OF COMMITTEE ROOMS.

MR. TALBOT (Oxford University): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether he will consider during the recess whether some better system of ventilation for the Committee rooms of the House can be devised, so as to prevent the oppression caused, not only during periods of great heat, but also when the weather does not allow of the opening of the windows.

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: I beg to refer my right hon. friend to the reply I gave yesterday to questions on this subject.

KENSINGTON GARDENS REGULATIONS.

EARL PERCY (Kensington, S.): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that Kensington Gardens, although opened to the public at 5 a.m. throughout the year, are closed even on the longest day at 9 p.m.; whether he is aware that many of the residents in the district can only use the gardens shortly before the hour at which they are now closed, and that inconvenience is caused to persons on their way between Kensington and Bayswater after dark owing to the necessity of making a wide detour; and whether, in view of the fact that neither the Green Park nor St. James's Park are closed at nightfall, he will consider the expediency of allowing the public to make use of Kensington Gardens, at least during the summer, up to 10 p.m.

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: Yes, Sir; I am aware of the facts stated in the first two paragraphs of my noble friend's question, but I would point out that the enclosure in St. James's Park is now shut at 8.30 p.m., and that in the Green Park which is open till 10 p.m. is lighted to a great extent. If Kensington Gardens were kept open after dark it would be necessary to make provision for lighting and policing, and I regret I do not see my way to do this, nor do I think it would be desirable to do so. In the absence of police and lighting it would be a great mistake.

HOVE RECREATION GROUND.

SIR HENRY FLETCHER (Sussex, Lewes): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he has sanctioned the raising of a loan of £15,000 by the Corporation of Hove for the purposes of a recreation ground outside the limits of the borough. Whether he is aware that the sum to be borrowed represents only a small portion of what will probably be ultimately required, and that a petition signed by a body of working men residing in the parish of Aldrington was presented in opposition to the scheme; and whether, in these circumstances, he will take any steps to prevent so large an expenditure of ratepayers' money on this project.

THE SECRETARY TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (MR. T. W. RUSSELL, Tyrone, S.): The reply to the first paragraph of the question is in the affirmative. It is the case that further expenditure will be required in connection with the proposal of the corporation. The Local Government Board received petitions in opposition to the scheme, and they caused two local inquiries to be held on the subject. After full consideration they came to the conclusion not to withhold their sanction to the loan, and the matter cannot now be reopened.

LOCAL TAXATION RETURNS.

MR. CHANNING: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board when the Local Taxation Returns, presented on 28th May, will be delivered to Members; what has been the cause of the delay in printing and circulating these Returns; and whether he will take steps to place them in the hands of Members within the next few days.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: The portion of the Local Taxation Returns to which the Hon. Member refers was presented to the House in dummy, and considerable revision has since been found necessary. This has now been effected, and instructions will be given that the copies shall

be delivered to Members as early as practicable.

NEW SCIENCE AND ART REGULATIONS.

MR. HARWOOD (Bolton): On behalf of the hon. Member for West Nottingham, I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether an opportunity will be afforded for the discussion of the new regulations and alterations made in the Science and Art Directory during the session; and, if not, will the new regulations and alterations be suspended from operation until they shall have received the consideration of Parliament.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL ON EDUCATION (Sir J. GORST, Cambridge University): Yes; the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill will afford such an opportunity.

MR. HARWOOD: On behalf of the hon. Member for West Nottingham, I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education by what authority the regulations contained in the Science and Art Directory became lawful and operative without being laid upon the Table or being subject to discussion by this House.

SIR J. GORST: The Directory is always laid on the Table of both Houses, though there is no statutory obligation requiring this to be done.

MR. HARWOOD: On behalf of the hon. Member for West Nottingham, I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education if he will grant a Return of any correspondence from inspectors of schools or other persons containing recommendations or suggestions which have led to changes in the regulations issued in the Science and Art Directory whereby science and art grants are to be withheld from school boards except under novel and difficult conditions.

SIR J. GORST: There is no such correspondence, and there is no intention to withhold from school boards such grants as have been heretofore made to them by the Science and Art Department.

MR. HARWOOD: On behalf of the hon. Member for West Nottingham, I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether the new regulations in the Science and Art Directory will debar school boards from receiving science and art grants in respect of pupil teacher schools or central classes for pupil teachers.

SIR J. GORST: The answer is in the negative.

MR. J. A. PEASE: I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether the Board of Education have so altered Clause 6 of the Science and Art Directory (1900) as to prevent school board classes, which are entirely dependent for local assistance upon the school fund, from participating in the grants administered by the Department of Science and Art.

SIR J. GORST: No such alteration has been made in Clause 6 of the Directory. The meaning of that clause is the same as it has been for many years, the words added being for the purpose of preventing a misinterpretation pointed out as possible by the school boards. But the Department has always held that the application of the school fund to science and art instruction, except in the case of pupil teachers, was illegal.

LONDON SCHOOL BOARD — HIGHER ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether the London School Board have applied for recognition of certain higher elementary schools with a modern curriculum not scientific in a preponderating degree, such as was recommended officially to the London School Board by reports of Her Majesty's Inspectors forwarded by the Board of Education; whether he is aware that as the result of a conference attended by Her Majesty's Chief Inspectors the London School Board adopted the recommendation as to curriculum; whether the Board of Education recommends schools with a prevailing modern and general education as equally suitable as, and in some towns and districts more suitable than schools of the type of the schools of science; and whether there is anything in the Minute limiting the

recognition of higher elementary schools to schools whose curriculum bears a close resemblance to the curriculum of a school of science; and whether the Board of Education will leave local managers free to consult the needs of their localities in framing curricula for acceptance in higher elementary schools.

SIR J. GORST: The London School Board have applied for the recognition as higher elementary schools of seventy schools with a curriculum not scientific in a preponderating degree. The reports of Her Majesty's inspectors have, no doubt, expressed the view that a curriculum preparing scholars for the subsequent study of commercial subjects is suitable to public elementary schools in London. I am not aware of the grounds which induced the London School Board to adopt such a curriculum in the seventy schools above mentioned. The answer to the third paragraph of the question is in the affirmative. The scale of grants in the higher elementary schools minute is framed for schools whose curriculum bears a close resemblance to the curriculum of a school of science. It would be much too high for schools of the type described in the earlier paragraphs of the question. The Board of Education desire to leave to managers the greatest possible discretion in framing the curricula for their school; but they cannot pay the high grants of the higher elementary schools minute except to schools whose curriculum bears a close resemblance to the curriculum of a school of science.

MR. LOUGH: To how many of these seventy schools is the Board of Education prepared to pay the higher grants asked for by the London School Board?

SIR J. GORST: Not one; because the curriculum is of a commercial and not a scientific nature.

FOOD PRESERVATIVES.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General whether, as a Departmental Committee is now scientifically investigating the question of adding preservatives to food, and will report by the end of the year, he will send an intimation to all judicial authorities before whom any cases of adding preservatives to Devonshire cream may be brought, that it would be expedient to adjourn the proceedings until after the Departmental Committee has given its decision.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs): I have no authority to interfere with the discretion of judicial authorities in the way suggested in the question, and it would be most improper for me to attempt to do so.

RURAL POSTMEN'S SHELTERS.

MR. STEADMAN (Tower Hamlets, Stepney): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if the Department can see its way to relieve rural postmen of the responsibility of finding sites for shelters for their use at the outward end of their journey.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. HANBURY, Preston): The present arrangement under which postmen obtain the necessary permission for placing shelters at the end of their walks is found to be convenient and to work without any practical difficulty; and the Postmaster General sees no reason for changing it. The shelters have sometimes to be moved from one point to another; and a formal tenancy of the site by the Postmaster General would in many cases create difficulties.

POSTMEN'S UNIFORMS.

DR. TANNER: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if he will state what is the relative weight of postmen's winter and summer uniforms.

MR. HANBURY: The weights of postmen's winter and summer uniform, including the shako, but excluding great-coat and waterproof cape, are as follows:—London: Winter uniform, 8 lb. 6 oz.; summer uniform, 5 lb. 6½ oz. Provincial: Winter uniform, 6 lb. 8 oz.; summer uniform, 5 lb. 7 oz. Great-coat: London, 5 lb. 11 oz.; provinces, 4 lb. 6 oz. Cape (waterproof), 2 lb. 12 oz.

TRADE MARKS—"FOREIGN ORIGIN."

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if the Law Advisers of the Crown have given their opinion as to the requirement by

The Merchandise Marks Act, 1887, of a definite indication of foreign origin on any imported decorated tin box intended to pass into the permanent use of the consumer, if it bears the name of an English firm or English wording or marks, raising the presumption that the box was made by British labour.

MR. HANBURY: The question, which has necessitated correspondence between several Departments, is found to be one of some complication. But a case is being prepared and will shortly be submitted to the Law officers.

CIVIL SERVICE ABSTRACTORS – TERMS OF SERVICE.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Kerry, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether any intimation was given to the registered men copyists promoted abstractors, under the conditions stated in the notice from the Civil Service Commissioners, dated 7th April, 1894, that they would be deprived compulsorily of the right, assured to them by the Treasury, of serving until they reached a maximum salary of £150 per annum, through an Order in Council carrying retrospective penal effects to come into force on 30th November, 1899; and, if not so intimated, can he state under what authority the Secretary of State for War claims to act in the case of two abstractors in the War Office, one of whom has made timely protest against being required to accept the terms of such retrospective penal enactment.

MR. HANBURY: The Treasury gave no assurance that the abstractors in question should serve until they reached a maximum salary of £150 per annum. As they were allowed to enter the class of abstractors up to the age of sixty, some of them might have claimed under such an assurance to remain till they were eighty or ninety years of age. I explained to the hon. Baronet on the 5th instant that the Order gives full authority to the Secretary of State to call upon abstractors to retire at sixty.

COUNTY COURT FEES.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General whether the Committee on County Court Fees has reported, and whether the nature of the Report will be made known to the House.

MR. HANBURY: The Committee have reported, and the substance of their recommendations has already been adopted in a Draft Order, which will shortly be made public under the Rules Publication Act.

IRISH LUNATIC ASYLUMS BOARD—SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he has considered the arguments for an increased grant in excess of the Supplemental Estimate put forward on behalf of the Irish Lunatic Asylum Boards by the Most Rev. Dr. Kelly and others, and whether an opportunity for discussing the Supplementary Estimate will be afforded.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): I have considered the arguments put before me in this matter. I understand that it was suggested that some payment in excess of the Supplementary Estimate should be made for the first financial year of the new system, because the licences taken out in the previous year covered part of that year, and the payments for licences during that year were in many cases not made until a considerable part of it had expired. But this view was based on a misconception of the fifty-eighth section of the Act of 1898, which provided, not that the sum paid for licences in the first financial year of the new system should be paid to the Local Taxation Account, but that a sum equal to the amount collected for such licences in the previous financial year should be so paid—and this payment will be made to the Local Taxation Account early in the financial year, certainly not later than May. I do not, therefore, consider that there is any ground for the request for an increased grant. I will convey to the Leader of the House the suggestion of the hon. and learned Gentleman that some opportunity should be afforded for discussing the Supplementary Estimate. But I can make no statement on that matter myself.

DERRY MAGISTRACY.

MR. ARTHUR J. MOORE (Londonderry): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state how many Protestant and how many Roman Catholic magistrates there

are in Derry city; and whether the Irish Government are prepared to take all reasonable steps to redress any inequality, and afford a due representation on the bench to the majority of the inhabitants of the city.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. G. W. BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): The number of magistrates in the city of Londonderry is forty-eight, of whom eighteen are Presbyterians, seventeen Roman Catholics, eight Protestant Episcopalians, four are Methodists, and one is a Baptist. I am not prepared to admit that the religion of the majority of the inhabitants should be the determining factor in the appointment of magistrates, but if the hon. Member desires to submit to the Lord Lieutenant the names of any eligible candidates for the position his suggestions would, of course, receive consideration.

GRANTS-IN-AID TO IRISH ASYLUMS.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the amount due by the Treasury to the Irish Local Taxation Fund in respect of the grant-in-aid for Irish asylums, and how this figure was arrived at; and if he will also state how the money refunded will be allocated; and whether a proportionate amount, and, if so, how much to each, will be paid to the county councils of the various counties towards the upkeep of their respective asylums.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: The amount due to the Local Taxation (Ireland) Account in respect of the grant-in-aid for pauper lunatics, and the manner in which the amount was arrived at will be found described in the Supplementary Estimate. The money, when voted, will be paid into the Local Taxation Account and will be available for the purposes mentioned in Section 58 of the Local Government Act of 1898.

GRANTS FOR MALICIOUS INJURIES IN IRELAND.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he would consider the advisability of presenting annually to Parliament, or including in the judicial statistics particulars by counties and boroughs of the grants for malicious injuries in Ireland, showing the amount and nature of the claim, the number of dismisses, and generally the result of traverse or appeal; and could he state the amount levied for injuries for the first year under the Local Government Act, as compared with the last year under the grand jury system.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: Detailed information on the points mentioned in the first paragraph will be included in future annual reports on judicial statistics in Ireland. It will take some days to collect the information desired in the second paragraph. It has been called for, however, and, when received, will be forwarded to the hon. Member.

CORK LAND COMMISSION.

DR. TANNER: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state when it is proposed to hold the next Land Commission Courts in Macroom and Millstreet respectively, when were the last courts held, and how many cases remained unheard.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: A sub-commission last sat in Millstreet in October, and for the disposal of cases from Macroom in February. Forty-one cases from Millstreet and sixty-eight from Macroom district have not yet been listed for hearing. It is not, at present, possible to say when the next sitting of a sub-commission will be held in either of these districts.

MUZZLING REGULATIONS IN CORK.

MR. MAURICE HEALY (Cork): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture for Ireland whether he will now suspend the dogs muzzling regulations in the city and county of Cork.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOR IRELAND (Mr. PLUNKETT, Dublin County, S.): A case of rabies occurred in the Fermoy union so recently as the 10th ultimo, the origin of which has not as yet been traced. Inquiry into the matter is still in progress, and in the circumstances it would be premature, at present, to relax the restrictions in the county and city of Cork.

NEWBLISS P.O.—DELIVERY OF TELEGRAMS BY GIRLS.

MR. MACALEESE (Monaghan, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether the Department sanctions the practice of using girl telegraph learners to deliver postal messages, as in the case of the Newbliss post office; whether such practice prevails in any part of England; and will he issue instructions for this system to be discontinued.

MR. HANBURY: Yes, Sir; it is with the sanction of the Department that assistants at a post office like Newbliss, whether they be girls or boys, are employed in the delivery of telegraph (not postal) messages. Such a practice prevails in England.

LIMAVADY POSTMASTERSHIP.

MR. ARTHUR J. MOORE: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if he can state how long the position of Postmaster of Limavady has been vacant and for what reason, and whether the Department are paying the late postmaster a rent for the present post office premises; and whether, seeing that such premises are small and ill-ventilated, and unsuitable for the requirements of the locality, the Department will take steps to appoint a postmaster and supply proper accommodation for the public.

MR. HANBURY: The postmastership of Limavady has been vacant since 1st November, 1899. The delay in filling the vacancy has been caused by necessary inquiries as to a revision of the arrangements for carrying on the work of the office, and inquiries with a view to finding the most suitable candidate to fill the vacancy. A rent is being paid to the late postmaster for the use of his premises. The vacancy will be filled on the earliest possible date, and one of the conditions of the appointment will be that the candidate provides accommodation for the work of the office.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Is it not the case that all the north of Ireland is up in arms if a Catholic postmaster is appointed?

[No answer was given.]

IRISH NATIONAL TEACHERS' ARREARS OF FEE GRANT.

CAPTAIN DONELAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can say when the Irish national teachers will receive the arrears of fee grant which accrued between the years 1893 and 1896.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: I have already more than once stated that the money cannot be paid until the Vote has been passed.

CAPTAIN DONELAN: When is it likely to be passed?

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: We got the Vote the other day, but Report of it has still to be obtained.

INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION BOARD CLERKS.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the clerks who are to receive pensions under the Intermediate Education Bill have been appointed by competitive examination; and, if not, how will future clerks be appointed.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR: The present clerks of the Board were not appointed by competitive examination. The appointment to these posts is vested by statute in the Board, and I am unable to say in what manner the power of appointment will be exercised hereafter.

BEER RETAILERS' AND SPIRIT GROCERS' LICENCES (IRELAND) (No. 2) BILL.

Lords Amendments to be considered forthwith; considered, and agreed to.

MUNICIPAL TRADING (JOINT COMMITTEE).

Report from the Select Committee appointed to join with a Committee of the Lords on Municipal Trading, with Minutes of Evidence and an Appendix, brought up, and read [Inquiry not completed].

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 305.]

NAVY AND ARMY EXPENDITURE, 1898-99.

Committee to consider the Savings and Deficiencies upon Navy and Army Grants for 1898-99, and the temporary sanction obtained from the Treasury by the Navy and Army Departments to the Expenditure not provided for in the Grants for that year, upon Monday next.

Ordered, That the Appropriation Accounts for the Navy and Army Departments, which were presented upon the 15th day of February last, be referred to the Committee.—(*Mr. Hanbury.*)

INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION (IRELAND) BILL.

As amended, in the Committee, to be printed. [Bill 315.]

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—County and Borough Franchise Assimilation (London) Bill, without amendment.

That they have agreed to—Merchant Shipping (Liability of Shipowners and Others) Bill, with an Amendment.

That they have agreed to—Cruelty to Wild Animals in Captivity Bill, with Amendment.

SUPPLY [21ST ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

ARMY (SUPPLEMENTARY) ESTIMATE, 1900-1901.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £11,500,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for Additional Expenditure, mainly due to the war in South Africa and to affairs in China, in respect of the following Army Services, viz. :—

	£
Vote 1. Pay, etc., of the Army ...	3,250,000
Vote 2. Medical Establishment: Pay, etc.	350,000
Vote 5. Volunteer Corps: Pay and Allowances	500,000
Vote 6. Transport and Remounts	4,500,000
Vote 7. Provisions, Forage, and other Supplies	850,000
Vote 8. Clothing Establishments and Services	100,000
Vote 9. Warlike and other Stores	500,000
Vote 10. Works, etc.: Cost (including Staff for Engineer Services)	1,060,000
Vote 12. Miscellaneous Effective Services	140,000
Vote 14. Non-Effective Services, Officers	250,000
Total ...	£11,500,000"

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): The presentation of this Supplementary Estimate for eleven and a half millions has been designedly delayed until a late period of the session, because it necessarily includes provision for two purposes—the continuance of the war in South Africa and the military operations in China, the extent and cost of which cannot with any accuracy be gauged. Indeed, in spite of this delay, it has not been possible to make a forecast which approaches to the accuracy which the Committee of Supply very properly expects in an ordinary year. This estimate has been framed to meet all the charges that will come in course of payment until the end of February, 1901. It leaves the month of March open, so that when the House reassembles it will be in the power of the Committee of the House to revise or to confirm the provisions that we have made in such a way as to see that our books balance at the end of the financial year. This Estimate is the second Army Estimate which it has been my duty to submit this year. It is the fourth Army Estimate I have had to submit since the beginning of the war. In the statements with which I introduced those previous Estimates, and in debates, I have already said all that, as it seemed to me, could usefully be said on some of those wider questions of military policy which arise out of Estimates of this magnitude. I do not propose this afternoon to repeat what I have said. I think that would serve no useful purpose. My views on the efforts made by this Government at the outbreak of the war, on the efforts made since to prosecute the war and provide for home defence, have been very fully laid before this Committee, and I should not be justified in travelling over the same ground again. But there are two other large questions of military policy which I have not yet discussed, and which I do not propose to discuss this afternoon. The first is the question of the operations of our Army in the field. At the beginning of the session it was generally felt that it would not be wise to criticise or discuss the strategy and tactics of our generals or the comparative value of the different arms of the service until the end of the war, and until the experience gained by the war had been analysed. There is another very important question which I do not pro-

pose to discuss. It is sometimes called "reorganisation" for brevity, for the word is not very explicit. What we mean by it is the fitting of the whole of our military system, of the War Office, and of the Army to meet the needs of the Empire and the conditions of modern warfare. The opinion was very generally entertained and expressed earlier in the year, and notably by the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean and by the Leader of the Opposition, that a time of war is not a time for attacking these large questions of reconstruction and reorganisation. I shared the view then expressed; I hold it now, and I hope it is still generally shared. But there is one important question arising out of this war which I have been charged with unduly neglecting, particularly upon one occasion, and which certainly has been elbowed out of our debates by more exciting topics—I mean the question of the finance of the war. I plead guilty to having said very little about that during this session. How much has the war cost? How much is the war going to cost? Hon. Members cheer, and they have perhaps in their minds the sum total of all the totals which have been asked for, but these questions are not so simple as they seem. Following our procedure—and I think very properly following it, for reasons I gave last October—the procedure of distributing the sums for which we have obtained sanction over the Vote, with which we are familiar, it is very difficult to extricate from any one Estimate the amount which is directly chargeable for war, and still harder to extricate the total from those four Estimates, and it is very difficult to distinguish the charges which are directly due to the war from the charges which are indirectly due to the war, which are mainly but not wholly due to the war; the charges which have nothing to do with the war, and the charges for the permanent increase of our Army, whether at home or in certain other parts of the Empire outside South Africa. But, before I come to this question of the finance of the war—I gather that some members of the Committee would be glad that I should do so—I must, if I may so put it, get China out of the way, not because it is not a subject of the most vital importance, but because in respect of China I am here merely as an accountant. In so far as the organisation of the military expedition is concerned, my noble friend the Secretary of State for India, I imagine, would be able to give greater information than I can, and so far as the policy that points to the despatch of such an expedition is concerned I must refer hon. Members to the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs. All I have to do with is to state how much there is for China on this Supplementary Estimate. In order to repay the prime charge and the recurring charge up to the end of February, for the force which India has up till now put at our disposal, a sum of £1,574,000 is taken on various Votes in this Estimate. But recent experience has taught us that you cannot proceed in these matters on a narrow margin. There may be sickness, losses in China, and therefore the Estimate is increased in this Supplementary Estimate to the round number of £2,000,000. That leaves a margin for an expedition of the size which is now proposed—about 11,000 combatants and 4,000 coolies, with transports and other munitions of war. But would it be wise to tie our hands in such a manner that it would be impossible to send reinforcements? In the opinion of the Government it would not be wise. Therefore, in this Estimate a further sum of one million is taken as a second line of reserve in respect of China, and from the total of eleven and a half millions which appears on the face of the Estimate I must ask the Committee, before coming to the question of the finance of the war in South Africa, to deduct a round total of £3,000,000. These three millions are distributed over the Vote. That is done for reasons I urged last October, and it was, I think, very generally accepted that you cannot have proper account keeping if you pool all your accounts into a Vote on account during a time of exceptional necessity. It may be convenient to hon. Members that I should now recall to their minds the sums we have voted on previous Estimates in respect of South Africa—sums directly due to the war in South Africa. In the first Estimate in October last, the total of which was ten millions, the charges directly springing from the war were £9,434,000. In the second Supplementary Estimate introduced on 13th February, the sum for those direct charges was over £12,580,000. In the Estimates introduced on 12th March, the direct charge was a little over thirty-one and a

half millions, and that was so stated on page 6 of the Estimates. Until now, therefore, the Committee of this House has sanctioned for charges arising directly out of the war in South Africa a total of £53,582,700.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): And eight millions now.

MR. WYNDHAM: Perhaps the hon. Member will allow me to make my statement in my own way. We cannot take the whole of the eight millions and a half for charges springing directly out of the war. I think it will be more convenient to deal first with charges springing directly out of the war, and then proceed with indirect charges, and then with charges that have nothing to do with the war at all. When I introduced the Estimate for the year for the war for thirty-one and a half millions I pointed out three things. I said we included nothing for what are called terminal charges, we included nothing for gratuities to troops in that Estimate, nor for the cost of transporting the troops back to this country, or India, or the colonies. In the second place, I said that those Estimates were framed under exceptional circumstances, that they partook somewhat of the nature of a "shot," and that it was impossible to present them with the accuracy which can be obtained in times of peace. In the third place, I pointed out that it had been necessary to divide what I have called war at full pressure from war at half pressure in a somewhat arbitrary manner. Of course, one merges by imperceptible degrees in the other, and so in turn does war at half pressure merge into what may be called military occupation when war has ceased. It is very difficult to distinguish quite accurately between these phases. In the Estimate of the year for the war, thirty-one and a half millions, the sum of half a million was taken for the huts in South Africa to accommodate the permanent garrison that would be left there, and that is a sum which cannot quite properly be considered a direct charge of the war. In this Estimate, omitting China, there is a sum of eight and a half millions. To that I will ask the Committee to apply the same consideration. It includes money for permanent charges, it includes money for the excess which has arisen from the fact that the first Estimate partook somewhat of the nature of a shot, and it includes a further sum for what I call military occupation. That is all it includes in respect of the war. I will deal with the terminal charges first. For transport for bringing the troops home we are asking sanction for £2,650,000. That is sufficient to take back the Indian contingent to India, to take the colonial contingent back to the colonies, and to bring 135,000 Imperial troops from Africa to this country. At this moment there are in South Africa 223,500 men in all, and of these 189,900 are Imperial troops and about 10,000 Indian troops. We are asking for sea transport to bring back 135,000 men, which leaves in South Africa about 45,000 men. The permanent garrison has been estimated by Lord Roberts at 30,000 men, and we have been advised from South Africa that some 15,000 men —Yeomen, colonists, and Reservists— may make their home there. Therefore no cause has so far arisen for providing for bringing back more troops than I have named. Then the other factor in the terminal charges consists of the gratuities. These have been calculated upon a basis of £5 as the unit. The private soldier will receive £5, and officers and others will receive multiples of that sum calculated in accordance with their rank. There is also provision made which will enable us to give a suit of plain clothes to every Reservist on his return, and further provision is made for the issue of a medal and other minor matters, into which I will go later on if I am asked. The total for gratuities taken in these Estimates is £2,950,000, which, added to the amount required for transport, gives a total for terminal charges in these Estimates of £5,600,000. Then I come to the second point, the question of excess over the Estimates for the year presented in March. Those Estimates were intended to meet the charges of the war for the financial year, for war at full pressure for six months, and at half pressure for the remaining moiety of the year, but of course they were framed some time before they were laid before the House, and before orders had been given for the 8th Division to proceed to South Africa. They were framed upon the basis of about 190,000 then being employed in South Africa, and the force there now, as I have told the Committee, numbers over 220,000. That being so, for what may fairly be called not a miscalculation, but a shortcoming in the

Estimates submitted in March, we are taking now £1,090,000. But in these Estimates and in respect of the war there are other sums which come under the third head I have submitted, sums which partake of the character of provision for military occupation. There is one sum which I should like to explain, namely, £250,000 for rolling stock. When earlier in the session I said that Lord Roberts had asked for rolling stock, and that we had undertaken to provide it, it was held, somewhat unfairly, I think, that this was an oversight on the part of the Government. Rolling stock for a 3ft. 6in. gauge cannot be obtained within less than nine months, and there was no cause for providing it at the beginning of the war, and Lord Roberts applied to us on the ground that after the war the rolling stock would be exhausted to such an extent that for purposes of military occupation, it would be necessary to renew it to a certain amount. For that we are now asking £250,000. And then also under this third head of sums which fall rather under the head of military occupation there is a further £500,000 to provide huts for the garrison left in South Africa, making in all £1,000,000 for that service. In these Estimates for the war in South Africa we are asking for £7,440,000, and it may interest the Committee to know that the total in all the Estimates for charges arising out of the war is £61,220,700; but that includes £1,000,000 for huts and £250,000 for rolling stock. That takes us, if our forecasts are accurate, to the end of February next year, and I do not think that any large sum in addition will have to be asked for when Parliament meets. But there are other charges which arise indirectly out of the war, and if the Committee care to have them I can give them. In the Estimates of October last there was a sum of £566,000 for the embodiment of the Militia and raising certain artillery batteries and cavalry regiments from the lower to the higher standard. That I call an indirect charge. In the February Estimate there was a charge of £400,000 for the further embodiment of the Militia. In the Estimates for the year we took £6,228,000 for what is called the emergency scheme for home defence, and in these Estimates we are taking £500,000. That charge arises out of the magnificent response made by the Volunteers to meet the facilities offered to them under that scheme. It may interest the Committee to know that there will be or have been in camp for fourteen days 59 Volunteer artillery corps out of 66, 26 engineer corps out of 28, and 203 infantry corps out of 216, or, in all, about 150,000 men out of about 240,000. I call that a magnificent response. All these are receiving allowances for transport which enable them to bring into camp about one-half of the transport they would require in war. Of course, the whole of the Militia has been embodied, and transport has been provided for the Militia out of Government stores and horses out of the Remount Department. It is entirely in consequence of the Volunteers that there has been this further sum of £500,000 upon the Estimate now submitted, and that sum ought to be credited to what I call excess, though the result of the expenditure is one on which I congratulate myself and the country. Then I come to the permanent charge in this Estimate. We are taking a further sum of £500,000 for huts in this country. When I introduced the Estimates of the year I pointed out that there might be some overlapping in consequence of the return of some of the troops before we were in a position to disembody the Militia; but even with that we shall be in great straits when the camping season comes to an end. We have 50,000 more men in this country than we can accommodate in barracks. Therefore it is necessary to increase the estimate for hutting in order to provide against overlapping. That is one of those services which it is rather hard to characterise accurately. In a sense it is part of the emergency scheme for home defence, because it provides accommodation for the Militia who have been embodied this year; but pains have been taken to secure a pattern of hut which will last for some time, and which will be available for housing some of the permanent increase of the Army; so the charge partakes of the nature of a charge arising out of the emergency scheme and also of the nature of a charge for the permanent service. I think the amount is very satisfactorily booked to disclose its nature, because, as the first part was put as an emergency charge in the Estimates of the year, I consider this part may be put as a permanent charge. Then in this Estimate there are three other services of a per-

manent nature. The Committee will recollect that in the case of the Loans Bill of last year, in deference to views which were expressed, I put the schedule into the Act. I first submitted it as a Parliamentary Paper, but was asked to put it into the Act. That being so, it is impossible to begin a new service without coming to this House for Parliamentary sanction. There is one service I recommend with some confidence to the Committee, and that is for barracks at Khartoum. Sir Francis Wingate has recommended that it is necessary to have a battalion at Khartoum not only for the health of our troops, but also for the effect on the country we have recently settled, and that it is wise to build permanent barracks and unwise to put up huts or tents as having a tendency to show we had come to stay. Therefore in this Estimate we are asking for £35,000 for barracks at Khartoum; and we are also asking for £15,000 for barracks at Mauritius. Hon. Members may remember that when I introduced the Estimates of the year I said there was to be a new foreign roster on a small scale for the Indian Army. They were to raise two more battalions than they needed for India in order to provide a garrison for Mauritius. Then we take £10,000 in order that the men of the Reserve may receive 6d. instead of 4d. a day in consequence of the heavier obligations placed upon them. Thus in this Estimate we are taking £560,000 for the permanent services which have nothing to do with the war at all, £500,000 for the emergency scheme, more or less, £7,440,000 for the war in South Africa, and £3,000,000 for China. I must apologise to the Committee for having to ask it to follow me in these intricate figures. The £560,000 includes a small sum for a very important service, and, if sanctioned by the Committee, will commit this House —as far as one House of Commons can commit another—to heavy expenditure in the future. Perhaps I may be allowed to lead up to that by completing, in respect of the permanent increase, the task I have undertaken as regards direct and indirect charges. In February's Supplementary Estimate, the Committee voted £20,000 towards the permanent increase of artillery. In the War Estimates of the year we voted £1,925,000 towards the permanent increase of four battalions of infantry. That included, as I was careful to state at the time, a sum of £48,000 to enable us to begin setting up store-houses in different parts of the United Kingdom, because it was the intention of the Government to provide in larger quantities fixed reserves of stores, the cause of that being that it would not any longer be prudent, or indeed possible, to pile them up at Pimlico or Woolwich, and that it was desirable to distribute them at appropriate places throughout the United Kingdom. In that Estimate we took £10,000 to purchase some of the articles which are to be put in the store-houses. But that sum gives no indication of the size of our operations, because of a fact which I think I can easily explain. In the Estimates for the year we took £750,000 to provide the Volunteer artillery with 4·7 guns. The whole of that provision cannot be got before next year, and there will be a balance available which will enable us to lose no time in obtaining so much of these stores before the end of February. Therefore I am perfectly frank with the Committee. We have come to ask the Committee to confirm the sanction which it has indeed given by passing the sum of £48,000 in the Estimates of the year.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Will the hon. Gentleman give the nature of the stores?

MR. WYNDHAM: That is a matter I shall now deal with. It is one of very great importance. Perhaps in reply to that question which has been put to me I may ask the Committee to consider what we mean by reserve of stores. We do not mean mobilisation stores. A confusion is often entertained upon that subject We have had in this country for many years past a complete mobilisation equipment for a large force—two army corps. By a reserve of stores you mean something more than that. You mean a reserve of stores which will enable an army once in the field to remain there without throwing an undue tax on the productive powers of the ordnance factories or trade. By a reserve of stores you mean you will have a fixed amount of these various articles, munitions of war and clothing, and maintain them at that fixed rate. That can be done by treating such a reserve as you treat a cistern or a reservoir. What you take out at one end you must put in at the other. That is

very necessary, because there are two very difficult factors in the problem of providing reserves of stores for a military force. Perishability is the first. It is no use piling up stores and saying you will leave them there for ten or fifteen years. It varies in respect of different articles. Saddlery or harness will remain of value for a very much longer period, for example, than clothing. Another difficult factor in arriving at any policy of reserve stores is the expansibility of output of manufacture, whether at the ordnance factories or throughout the trade of the country. I know it has been said outside these walls that the Government are to blame for not having solved this problem more swiftly and at an earlier date. Is that a reasonable complaint? During several years, from 1895, the Government, with the assistance and support of the House, have been slowly and with difficulty increasing the establishment of our Army, and before there was any idea we were to go to war. Would it have been economical or sensible to pile up arms by nine battalions of infantry and sixteen batteries of artillery before the outbreak of the war, and before there was any idea that we were about to go to war? Would it have been economical or sensible to pile up clothing and equipment and great reserves of stores for a force which was not then in existence, but which we were seeking to create under circumstances of great difficulty, because raising the establishment in this country is a difficult thing, owing to the fact that recruiting varies from year to year? To plunge, without consideration, into the purchase of reserves of stores before you had reached the standard you proposed to yourself for the establishment of your Army would have been a thing no Government could have defended before the Committee. At the beginning of 1899 we were within measurable distance of reaching this standard in the establishment of the Army. The House has sanctioned since 1895 25,508 additional men; and when we arrived at the standard we proposed—namely, one which would enable us to mobilise two army corps—General Brackenbury became Director General of Ordnance. It became necessary to solve with every possible accuracy the question of perishability of material and the output of ordnance factories. A Committee was appointed which heard evidence not only from the contractors and the Director General of Ordnance and those who serve under him, but also from very nearly all the principal manufacturers in this country; so we had before us evidence which had to be sifted and examined if we were to hope for any proper solution of this very difficult problem of providing a reserve of stores. We propose to complete the equipment for horse artillery, field and siege artillery, and to increase the reserve of ammunition for these guns. The calculations have been made for the addition to the establishment of the Army of something like 25,000 men. There will be complete equipment for the artillery and a reserve of one battery to every four on the establishment. There will be machine guns for the infantry battalions and a reserve of 25 per cent. of guns and carriages. Now I come to the ordnance stores. What are they? The accoutrements, saddlery and harness, and all that is necessary for an army in the field. That has been calculated on the basis that we should have a reserve sufficient to maintain in the field for six months a force of three army corps, or 135,000 men. We might have an outbreak of influenza in a cavalry regiment, and the whole of the harness might become infected. Where, therefore, certain stores are subjected to higher risk, a higher rate of reserve has been calculated, and in respect of the ordnance stores for the force I have named a reserve will be provided for the whole establishment. As to clothing, the reserve is calculated on the basis that there should be sufficient to put into the field and maintain for six months in the field the force I have named, and beyond that there should be a reserve of six months clothing for the whole Army as a working margin, since the clothing is to be distributed at many different places. It is not possible to secure a reserve of clothing unless you can secure uniformity in clothing, and that is why the Government have come to the conclusion that the British Army will have to have one working dress for all branches and regiments of the service. Until it was possible to do that, and it has been found possible only owing to this war, it would have been insanity to pile up reserves of clothing of a pattern which no army would under any conceivable circumstances put on when it was called upon to fight. I think that is all I need say about this

reserve of stores. With certain not very large alterations we have made in the Arsenal, in the way of shifting the "danger" buildings away from the other sheds and so forth, the total provision for these reserves of stores would come to something like £4,692,711. I would like the Committee to concentrate their attention on this question of the reserve of stores—ordnance stores and clothing—for a force of the size which I have named. Naturally we cannot spend that sum all at once. It will take some three years to spend a sum of that magnitude. But in this Vote and in the grant of money allocated for 4·7 guns, which cannot be spent before February, we have enough to push ahead at a very rapid rate; and we intend to push ahead at a very rapid rate unless the Committee should refuse us Parliamentary sanction. I cannot expect such a vote from this Committee. We are often urged to fix responsibility upon individuals or upon bodies. It is very easy to fix responsibility here. The Director General of Ordnance, who has made his calculations and submitted them, is not responsible if they are rejected. The Army Board and the Commander-in-Chief, who have endorsed them, are not responsible; the Secretary of State who submitted them to the Exchequer is not responsible; and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who has most liberally undertaken to make the necessary provision, can never be held responsible. The only people who will be held responsible if this policy is not endorsed is the Committee of this House. I do submit to the Committee that it should endorse the liberal policy of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. It is true that one Parliament cannot bind another. But I ask the Committee to treat the Army in this matter as well as it treats the Navy. The Navy is allowed by Votes upon Estimates to begin services which cannot be completed until after a period of years. How can we expect the manufacturers of this country to fix their plant and their staff at a number which will supply the needs of the Empire in time of crisis unless we can go to them with some continuous policy? Are we to force them in the future as we have forced them in the past to look not to the needs of their own Empire, but to adventitious orders from South American Republics or barbarous States? That is the question. Unless you provide for the expansibility of output in a trade when the day of national crises comes this country will be unprepared. I respectfully submit this proposal in addition to the Estimates, and I trust the Committee will unanimously endorse the policy which has been adopted by the Government. I beg to move.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): The hon. Member the Under Secretary of State for War is such a favourite with the House that I am sure the Committee will welcome him in a new character. He has spoken to-night so exclusively upon finance that I almost thought I was listening to the annual Budget speech, and I am sure if in course of time the Chancellor of the Exchequer desires to change his office for another, we should find in the hon. Member a fit successor. The hon. Gentleman suggested that we should concentrate our attention especially on the question of the reserves of warlike stores. There certainly can be no one in the House who attaches greater importance than I do to the arrangements for a proper reserve of warlike stores; but we shall have all next week in which hon. Members who are greatly interested in finance will be able to discuss the financial aspects of the proposals now before the House, whereas to-night is the only opportunity we shall have during this session for discussing military problems, and to-night is the proper occasion for so doing. The hon. Member, in his very lucid statement, was guilty of a few omissions, although, of course, he said he would be glad to deal with any questions which might arise in the course of the debate. I ventured to ask him across the House whether there were any savings upon several of the heads upon which money was taken in connection with the emergency proposals at the beginning of the present war, because the War Office, like the Admiralty, has the power to divert, with the leave of the Treasury, savings from one head to another, and money which we have voted for one purpose may be devoted to another.

MR. WYNDHAM was understood to say that he referred to one case of that character.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: I asked especially with regard to the statement the hon.

Member made as to an excess of £500,000 on the emergency Volunteer proposal. But has there not been a large saving on that head in respect of the Royal Reserve battalions? Has anything like the amount voted by this Committee at the beginning of the year been spent for the pay and other expenses of the Royal Reserve battalions? The hon. Gentleman appeared to draw some distinction between the proposals which the Government make to the Committee and the proposals which the Committee agree to. He told us that the responsibility in these matters did not lie with the Commander-in-Chief or even with the Secretary of State, but with the Committee of the House of Commons. Our complaint in the past has always been—and I think with truth—that while the Committee of this House was willing to grant all that was asked for, and never refused anything that was asked for by the responsible Government for the safety of the country, the proposals made by the Government were often inadequate. I desire to ask also whether the hon. Member can give us to-night some information a little more definite and a little more reassuring than the perfunctory answers which have been given in both Houses with regard to the condition in which the Royal Reserve battalions have stood. We have eyes ourselves, and many Members have looked at these things for themselves, and seen the Royal Reserve battalions in Ireland, at Aldershot, and in London. A very large proportion of the men were left to loaf, they were not supplied with clothing or arms, and they were not in a condition to do their work or to help in the ordinary drill. These notorious facts have not been admitted with the frankness with which they might have been. We are all familiar with the well-known case of an Irish cavalry Reserve regiment which was left until June without any of the necessaries of a cavalry regiment, so that drill was impossible. These occurrences have proved the wisdom of hon. Members who expressed grave doubts as to this Royal Reserve battalion system for which we voted so enormous a sum of money in the original Estimates of the year. Another point upon which the hon. Member has not, I think, been frank with the House, but with which I have no doubt he will deal later on, is the question of the Army Medical Department. There is an enormous Vote here for that Department, but the hon. Member has not said one word with regard to it. Considering the interest taken by the House lately in this subject, I think he ought to have explained to us what proportion of the Vote is for China, what proportion is for South Africa, and to what the South African proportion is intended to be devoted. It is easy for the Committee to vote large sums of money for the Army Medical Department, but the utility of voting those sums and the possibility by their means of coping with difficulties such as have recently arisen is another matter. There is no ground for wandering about the world in search of the actual facts. The facts are now officially admitted. It is admitted that in recent operations the Army Medical Department transport has been cut down to one-fifth of the regulation allowance, and under these circumstances the scandals which have arisen have been but the necessary result of the course which was taken—a course which had never previously been taken by the great military nations, and which has not been taken even under circumstances of the most extreme pressure by Germany. Another point to which the hon. Gentleman omitted to allude is the question of the additional gratuities which may have to be given. I do not know whether money is being taken for that purpose or not, but the Government are pledged by the statement they made after the unanimous vote of this House on the subject to do their utmost in the direction of an extension to the Army of the principles of the Workmen's Compensation Act. The Government said they could not carry out the actual terms of the resolution, but they promised to act in that direction, and to make a very considerable increase of the allowances, especially to the widow in cases of death. There is another matter which the hon. Gentleman has not mentioned except incidentally. He is taking money on this Vote for transport to take the white forces back to India, but he has not told us at what date the Government hope to restore those troops to India. At the beginning of the war the Government pledged themselves that it would be the first duty to replace the white forces. I understand that that arrangement continues, and therefore, as troops are withdrawn from Africa as occasion arises, the Indian forces will be the first to be with-

drawn. But the objections which many of us entertained to drawing so largely upon India continue; they have not lost force in the time which has elapsed. The state of things on the Afghan frontier, for instance, is not such at the present time as to permit with safety such a great diminution of white troops in India as has taken place in connection with this war. The hon. Gentleman made a very interesting statement to the Committee with regard to one item in the accounts he has placed before us concerning the rolling stock. I understand that this rolling stock is to take the place of rolling stock which may have been worn during the war. There is a fact in connection with that which I think is not well known to the Committee—namely, that we have paid throughout this war the fare of every soldier or horse conveyed by the Cape Railway. No soldier has been allowed to be moved, even under the most pressing circumstances, in the course of the military operations without the money being paid, so that this wear and tear of rolling stock has already been paid for, and it may be urged after the war that in replacing this rolling stock we are paying twice over on this point. The hon. Gentleman has deprecated the raising of questions of strategy during the war, and he has repeated what he said in the earlier part of the session as to the unwisdom of debating such subjects during the progress of the war. But I would point out that this is the only occasion we shall have for asking questions and calling attention to certain matters as to which we have no knowledge at the present time, although such knowledge necessarily bears upon the future reorganisation of the Army. They are matters upon which we cannot press for knowledge at any given moment, but we must point out the danger there is, if we leave these matters entirely in the hands of the Government, that that moment may never come. In the first debate on this subject in the present session some of us called attention to the successive checks and reverses, in many of which we have left prisoners in the hands of the enemy. Frequent questions have been put about them in the House. This war has been marked, as everybody knows, in a most extraordinary and entirely unprecedented degree, as far as the British Army is concerned, by the frequency of surrenders of small posts and unwounded prisoners. When we called attention to these matters in February last there had been two armoured trains, with two guns and 100 men; 300 men of the 18th Hussars and mounted infantry were captured after Glencoe; six companies were taken at Nicholson's Nek; then there was Farquhar's Farm. There was also the Stormberg reverse, with the loss of two guns and over 600 men; and there were the operations of Lord Methuen and Sir Redvers Buller, who lost eleven guns and 800 men, besides the disaster to the Suffolks. The same thing has continued since, and there is a necessity that at some time or another we should know, for the sake of the future training and recruiting of the Army, where the blame is to be fixed.

MR. WYNDHAM: Hear, hear!

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: The greatest writer who has written on military questions has said—

"Artillery and prisoners are at all times regarded as the true trophies of victory as well as its measure, because through these things its extent is declared beyond a doubt. Even the degree of moral superiority may be better judged by them than by any other relation."

During this war we have in an extraordinary number of cases lost unwounded prisoners to the enemy, which must be the result of the grossest mismanagement, or must bear essentially on our system of recruiting. We have also failed to capture the guns of the enemy in the same degree as they have captured ours, which shows a defect in the conduct of the operations of our cavalry. On the 10th May† a Conservative Member of this House asked a question which led to an exchange of views upon this subject across the floor of the House, which was considered thoroughly satisfactory at the time, but which seems to have become a little weak ever since. In a question on the 10th May, as in a question to-night, reference was made to previous cases of surrender, and the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary said that by the Queen's regulations a court of inquiry in every case would be held as soon as possible after the return of the prisoners to duty. In that case the Under Secretary answered "yes," but in answer to

† See *The Parliamentary Debates*, Vol. lxxxii., page 1,235.

a similar question to-night he has been less clear. He has stated that some sort of inquiry is to be held, but I begin to fear that unless the Committee presses the Government we have no security that these matters will really be probed to the bottom at some time. These prisoners returned to their duty in June. In answer to a question as to a particular surrender of Yeomanry, the Under Secretary said that an inquiry could not be held because the prisoners had not been recovered. In the case of the vast majority of prisoners at Pretoria they returned to duty and had been employed in war since. Some of them had been captured again, not by their own fault, but because they were armed with an inferior rifle. On the 10th May last the Under Secretary was asked what form the inquiry would take, and he used these words—

"In the first instance the inquiry will be by the Commander-in-Chief at the theatre of war."

I confess I gathered from that that the matter would afterwards be reviewed by the Government, and the country would be informed of the result, if it was thought safe, in order that we might have that knowledge which has so essential a bearing upon the training of the Army. Instead of using the words "in the first instance" and "at the end of the war," which were used on the 10th May, they have assumed that some sort of inquiry may have been held without anybody knowing anything about it.

MR. WYNDHAM: The right hon. Gentleman misunderstands the nature of my answers. My answer to-day was that we have not the information.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: I only want to enforce the necessity of having this information at some time or other.

MR. WYNDHAM: Hear, hear!

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: We do not want to worry Lord Roberts and interfere with his discretion in any way, but we do want to be quite certain that sooner or later we shall have these facts before us. The Leader of the House the other day, in the course of the debate, appeared to think that substantially no great harm had been done by the censorship, and he seemed to think that the country knew everything already because there had been no censorship of letters. He spoke of the correspondence, and when somebody asked him a question about censorship he said there was no censorship of letters. But surely the right hon. Gentleman is aware that in many parts of the theatre of war there has been a very strict censorship of letters.

MR. WYNDHAM: There was a censorship of letters for a time; but since February there has been no censorship at all of press letters from the front.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: There was a censorship on letters from Ladysmith till February, at any rate; and while everybody knew exactly what happened at Nicholson's Nek on "mournful Monday," no one knows what happened on the same day at Farquhar's Farm, simply because of the censorship. We know that the troops were afterwards shut up in Ladysmith, and during the siege every letter had to be posted open.

MR. WYNDHAM: Were the letters of the late Mr. Steevens censored?

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: Experienced correspondents like the late Mr. Steevens and Mr. Bennett Burleigh knew what they might write at a given time. But all letters were posted open during the siege of Ladysmith, and consequently they were read by the censor, and passages were struck out. I do not pretend to say that that was an improper practice in a besieged town, but that throws greater responsibility upon us at a later stage to see that these lessons are not lost, and that we should face the facts. Some of the facts did get out. A very admirable letter appeared in the *Calcutta Englishman* on 24th April after the censorship had been removed. Alluding to what passed at Farquhar's Farm on "mournful Monday" the *Calcutta Englishman* says—

"One cannot speak too strongly on the subject. To remain silent . . . after our experiences in South Africa is to court a national disaster."

I should not quote those words unless I entirely agreed with them, and I make that statement after having seen several officers who share my view, and after having had the advantage of reading the letters of two officers concerned in these operations, who were afterwards killed,

and whose letters have come home since. What occurred there is a matter which it is essential to investigate in order that we should know the truth, for it has an essential bearing upon the training and the recruiting of the Army; and further, it is one of those cases which, if not kept in view, might possibly escape attention, because it is not a case of the surrender of unwounded prisoners. These facts bear not only upon the general training of the officers and staff, but also upon the power of handling troops of all arms and upon the necessity of not isolating detachments of infantry without any guns or cavalry. Upon such matters as scouting and entrenching, the failure of our troops has been officially admitted. The House will remember that at Spion Kop in order to entrench it was necessary to send for the Royal Engineers—a thing which could not have happened in any other Army. The Under Secretary was asked to-night a question with regard to the great loss of prisoners which has continued since the war was said to have come virtually to an end. Since our last discussion upon the subject there have been constant instances of this kind. There was a surrender of convoys in February and in March, and the operations of the 31st March at Koorn Spruit or Sanna's Post, which resulted in the loss of seven guns and over 400 men. The incident at Sanna's Post shows the way in which, unless constant pressure is kept up here, information is forgotten to be given. We have had very full information with regard to the successful portion of that operation; four Victoria Crosses have been most properly given for conspicuous gallantry, and the account of that gallantry is rightly given. But, on the other hand, it is necessary that we should know how it came that there was such an extraordinary deficiency of scouting and military knowledge as to have led to so unprecedented a result. Then there was Reddersburg and 400 men; in May there was a squadron of Bethune's Horse with a Maxim; in May also there was the surprise of Sir Charles Warren—a surprise which cannot be alluded to without remembering that Sir Charles Warren was an officer who had been given high command without having had any recent military experience, and an officer in a position so high that I take it—I am not sure of this, but I take it in accordance with precedent—that his appointment was a Cabinet appointment. Sir Charles Warren was probably employed in South Africa on the strength of his successful Bechuanaland Expedition. But that was an expedition in which not a shot was fired, and the surprise of Sir Charles Warren in May is a matter which deserves inquiry. Then there was the surrender in June on two occasions of Yeomanry, alluded to to-night in the question of the hon. Member for Wandsworth. Then, also in June, there was a convoy with 160 Highlanders and the surrender of the Derbyshire Militia—a surrender which seems to me to reflect great discredit upon someone concerned with the staff arrangements there. To send a regiment of Militia by themselves without guns to occupy a position in face of an active enemy seems to me really to court disaster. A matter of this kind, which is almost without precedent, does seem to me to require attention. On the 14th June there was the most distressful incident of all, because it led to a repetition at Pretoria of those hardships which had been experienced by the army at Bloemfontein. We all know what the hardships at Bloemfontein have been, and they have been repeated at Pretoria. I do not say they have been repeated in all their incidents, but repeated as regards lack of food and extreme pressure and strain. The incident I refer to is the capture of the mail train and sixty men on the 14th June, when there was a destruction of an immense amount of ammunition, of the whole of the mails for a very long period, and of the warm clothing of the men. I imagine that money was also captured on that occasion, because it is undoubtedly the case that the troops at Pretoria went without their pay for some time, which is most unusual in the British Army. Then in July came Nitral's Nek. The affair at Nitral's Nek is a very remarkable occurrence of a wholly different kind from others we have known. The case of Nitral's Nek is almost the only one in which there was a detachment of all arms captured. There were a squadron of cavalry, two guns, Royal Horse Artillery, a number of mounted infantry, and a number of infantry in this surrender. The two last incidents, about which at present we know nothing, are the surrender of the supply train with 100 men and the surrender of another supply train with 200 Welsh Fusiliers. This is a distressing catalogue, but it is a catalogue to which we must not shut our eyes. It is a catalogue known in every country in the

world, and written about by every military writer in the world. The facts must be fully inquired into; they must not be hid; their bearing on the character of the training of our Army must be ascertained. The only point as to which at the present moment I should like to ask a question, arising out of the recent surrenders, concerns the horses—the remounts. The Under Secretary made a very full statement with regard to the responsibility of the Government in the matter of remounts some months ago. While it was undoubtedly most difficult to get horses up to Bloemfontein when there was great trouble on the lines of communication, and while now it may be very difficult to get horses up to Pretoria—I believe that at this moment the cavalry and mounted infantry at Pretoria have only one-fourth of their proper number of horses—it would seem on the face of things that there ought now to be no difficulty in having a full supply in the Orange River Colony. Yet, if there had been a full supply in the Orange River Colony, it would not have been necessary to send the Derbyshire Militia without guns and without cavalry, and probably the disasters on the lines of communication would have been avoided. I should like information on that point. The foreign writers who have written on these surrenders have not, as a rule, been unprejudiced men; and they have not in all cases been the best men in their various services, but there have been among them two men of very considerable standing, one of whom, General Von Blume, is peculiarly competent to write on the subject. He was Moltke's second assistant, he was an assistant in strategy, he wrote a great book on the operations of the German army from Sedan, and he has written recently the greatest of modern books on strategy. General Von Blume has answered conclusively what he calls "the conventional lie" that these troubles of ours have been due to new conditions of warfare. He points out the reasons which induce him to believe that every difficulty could have been foreseen, that there was nothing we ought not to have expected, and that the mistakes which have been made, and have had the results I have described, have been mistakes on immutable and permanent principles, and not because of anything new or peculiar in the present war. We are a military nation and have the military spirit, and I believe if we are told the truth in regard to these matters before interest in them has gone we shall be able to take the lessons to our hearts. There need be no asperity between the War Office and its critics upon these subjects. One of the great testimonies to the ability of the Under Secretary of State for War is the fact that, while we may have our differences with his Secretary of State, when he speaks in this House we are always inclined to believe that he really agrees with us beforehand, and that we should be in a better position if he had his way. I do not know whether that is so or not, but he gives us that impression, and we always speak with the feeling that we are speaking to one of ourselves. I do not wish to attack him in any way; we are all anxious to train the Army for war. We believe that the Army has not been properly trained for war in the past, and I doubt myself whether it is being properly so trained at the present moment at Aldershot Camp. I am bound to say from what I have heard from far better authorities than I can pretend to be that I very much doubt whether the training at Aldershot Camp even in this critical year has been of a nature really to prepare the Army for war. We are all determined that the training should be better in the future. After Lord Roberts and the men who have been of the most assistance to him on the staff have come home we shall be able to back them in any efforts they may make for improving the training of the Army for war; but we shall back them only if we have full knowledge, not if we are left in a condition of ignorance. I have two practical suggestions to throw out on that subject. I hope Lord Roberts will not be employed upon civil duty and so kept from giving us the full benefit of the enormous knowledge and the experience he has acquired with regard to the training of the British Army, but that he may be asked by the Government to write a general Report upon the points in regard to which he thinks the war has shown defects in the training and constitution of our Army and the respects in which he thinks it may be improved—how and why. In addition to that I hope the Government will propose to the House—which never refuses, as the Under Secretary seemed to think it might, the proposals of the War Office—a large contribution to the expenses of the Intelligence Department for a military history of the war. This work cannot be undertaken

on the funds at present allocated; it cannot be done rapidly until there is a special Vote for the purpose. I would suggest there should be a Vote of £10,000 for the purpose of doing that which no private individual can do—of making, with full knowledge, a history of the war as sound and as frank as the Prussian official history of the war of 1870-71—a history brought out rapidly instead of years afterwards, when all interest in the subject has evaporated except to students. I believe such a work would do much towards bringing about the end we all desire—namely, that at the termination of the war we should not lose the whole of the benefit of its lessons in mere congratulation.

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, S.E.): I desire to call attention very briefly to the remarkable policy of concealment adopted by the Government in reference to one or two very important matters at the seat of war during the last few months. I altogether fail to understand a policy which, to my mind, is Chinese and ostrich-like, and which, while making unpopular in the country a Government which, in my opinion, deserves the support of the nation, is doing no good whatever. I have heard of people running their heads against brick walls, but until now I never knew people to erect the brick wall to run their heads against as the War Office have done in this particular matter. The hon. Member for South Donegal, a little while ago, put a question to the Under Secretary for War in reference to one of these occurrences to which reference has been made, and he was told that no information was available. I, with some temerity perhaps, ventured to put a supplementary question to the hon. Gentleman, and was told that nobody knew the circumstances of the case except the Commander-in-Chief and the headquarters staff. That showed at once to my mind how badly the hon. Gentleman is served by his friends and subordinates. Everybody who knows anything about a camp knows that it is the home of all sorts of rumours and stories; it is impossible to conceal anything in a camp; and yet we are told that the hundreds of thousands of men in South Africa do not know what I know to be common knowledge. If there is one thing in which the British private soldier takes the keenest possible interest more than another it is in what his generals and officers are doing; and the hon. Gentleman takes up a considerable portion of his speech with references to the question of stores and equipment! That very question makes me very doubtful as to the possibility of the Army or the War Office being reformed within any reasonable time by the present Secretary for War. What did the Secretary for War tell the country the other day? He said that the stores and equipment were not sufficiently maintained. Again, he said three months ago at a public meeting that he was struck by the fact that there was a considerable deficiency, amounting to four and a half millions. This is a gentleman who is no irresponsible critic. He has been at the War Office for five years, and has been able to do absolutely what he liked. When he took up the fiddle, the rest had to dance to his music until he had finished. And he comes to Parliament at the eleventh hour and says that he is aware that the stores and equipment are deficient! How can we expect anything from a statesman, the Secretary for War, who is so absolutely unprepared for circumstances which must occur, as Lord Lansdowne has shown himself to be in this matter? The Under Secretary for War told us about the system, and he said he hoped in future to put as much into the system of reserve stores and equipments as he took out of it. It is common knowledge that that ought to have been done during the last six years, and not to have thought of it at the last moment. To the Secretary for War, and those higher than he, we look for the reorganisation of the War Office. The noble Marquess the head of the Government told us the other day that the defence of the country was not the business of the War Office, and he proposed to hand it over to the Grand Councillors of the Primrose League. Then we were told that Lord Lansdowne proposed to wait till these distinguished soldiers came back from South Africa. But what do these distinguished soldiers know of the War Office and its reorganisation? They are not bureaucrats; they are soldiers. They know nothing about the distribution of clerks in Pall Mall. It is not to the soldiers, who do not know that these misfortunes have come upon us owing to the disorganisation of the War Office, that we should look for reorganisation. Anyone who wants to know what is wrong with the War Office,

and what we ought to do, need not wait till these soldiers, distinguished or undistinguished, come home. All he has got to do is to read the Report of the Hartington Commission, and then take up the Report of the Committee presided over by the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs of three years ago, and he will see that it is absolutely impossible to have a reformed Army with an unreformed War Office. We are told that when the Army comes back from South Africa we shall be in a position of safety. But it is no use living in a fool's paradise or leaning on a broken reed. The other day the Under Secretary for War stated that 204,000 men had been sent out from this country to South Africa, and in addition to these there were 29,000 colonial irregular troops. Out of that total of 233,000 you have to deduct 28,000 in round numbers who have been killed, wounded, are sick or invalided home. Then you must deduct 12,000 more—the Yeomanry, Volunteers, Militia, and Army Reserves, who must return to civil life. Then you must further deduct the 10,000 men stolen from India, and the 15,000 withdrawn from the Mediterranean, and the permanent garrison to be left in South Africa, which the hon. Gentleman puts at 45,000. The result will be that instead of being, as the Secretary for War stated in public recently, able to have a body of 160,000 trained soldiers to do what you like with, the whole number of men would not amount to more than 30,000. We are told about the Reserve battalions, some of which, however, have not rifles or even belts, and which must be automatically dissolved in a few months, and cannot be sent out of the country, and which have cost two millions of money. That is not much to fall back upon, especially when, after the French Exhibition is over, it is possible we must look more closely to our defence. I have always been unable to understand the plans of the War Office as presented to this House. The War Office take the Reserve and, instead of that body being used as a reserve, it is thrown into the fighting line. Then the Militia are supposed to be for home defence, but they are sent abroad. The Militia Reserve has nothing to do with the Militia, but is sent as Regulars to duty at Gibraltar and at the home stations. These are among the many conundrums propounded at the War Office which I fail to understand.

Major Rasch.

Again, when the war is over one plan is to take the Reserve elsewhere, leaving the Empire to be guarded by an insufficient force—as it has been ever since we took over Egypt in 1882. Then we are told that the ballot for the Militia means carrying destruction to every cottage in the land and driving the people to emigrate. I think the noble Marquess who said that cannot have a very high opinion of the patriotism of this country. The most sensible plan, in my opinion, would be to raise the pay of the Regulars and the Militia until we get the right sort of men to join. If any gentleman desires to know what will ameliorate the condition of the soldier and induce him to enlist, I recommend him to read an excellent article in this morning's *Daily News*, which used to be considered the organ of the Nonconformists and Liberals, but has always taken a strong view of the Army. There is another course which I would like to recommend myself: that is to eviscerate, or rather to exterminate, if possible, the whole of what Sir George Chesney used to call the epitome of organisation run mad in Pall Mall—the War Office. I am afraid that will not happen in my time. If it did, nobody would be more delighted than myself, and I would be able to sing *Nunc dimittis*.

MR. PRITCHARD MORGAN (Merthyr Tydvil): I have only one observation to make. It is that I have had most reliable information that the British Minister and all the Ministers in Peking were safe on the 24th of this month.

*SIR J. COLOMB (Great Yarmouth): I take it that my hon. friend the Under Secretary for War is in full sympathy with the demand for an inquiry into events in South Africa; but I think it would be desirable if he gave a really distinct, explicit, and binding assurance on the part of the Government that the inquiry will be taken in hand. I entirely agree with the right hon. Baronet the Member for Forest of Dean as to voting a sum of money for a complete history of the war, but I trust if that is done it will not be used as a lever to postpone the inquiry. As I understood my hon. friend, the gratuity to the returned soldiers is to an average of £5 a head. And then he proceeded to say that the privates were to receive £5 and officers a multiple of £5. I cannot see how that would make £5 per unit.

MR. WYNDHAM: What I said was that the gratuities were calculated upon a basis of £5 as the unit. That is a technical term. The private soldier will receive £5 and the officers multiples of that sum calculated according to their rank.

*SIR J. COLOMB: I am glad of that explanation. There is another point which the Government would seriously have to consider—the principle of the new departure to be made in regard to old age pensions for every man who has fought for Her Majesty. I urge that that is the principle which ought to be adopted, because if the Government comes down here with a proposal for meeting the necessities of the Empire in respect of inducements to recruits, I cannot see how this question can be approached with any chance of success unless one of the inducements offered to the men is old age pensions. The only other point I wish to refer to is in connection with the reserve of stores. I do not think anything shows more completely that in the past the War Office has neglected its business than the fact that we have had no reserve at all. It is to the credit of my hon. friend that the Government have at last announced their intention of establishing a system by which there will be maintained for the service of the Empire an adequate proportion of surplus stores. That I congratulate the Government upon doing. My hon. friend to-day pointed out how essential this was. We all agreed with his desire to bind the House to this principle. I confess I wish the Government could bind the House a little more like naval programmes. We have the assurance of the Under Secretary of State for War that the Government intend to establish this system of reserves, but these words do not really establish as a principle of our military organisation the continuance of these. I am sorry that they do not come forward and spread the money necessary over so many years, and commit this House to a certain expenditure for so many years. [Mr. WYNDHAM signified that was the intention.] I am glad to have that principle accepted, because otherwise I should be entirely dissatisfied, and I should have little hope that after the excitement of this war is over that reserve would be sufficiently maintained. With regard to stores, equipment, and armaments, the War Office and my hon. friend deserve great credit for tackling this necessity and being prepared to deal with it, and at all events I think it indicates that it is more than probable that next year the Government intend to proceed on such lines as to define publicly the amount of stores that are to be provided. That will be extremely satisfactory. With regard to the distribution of the stores I have a word to say. You are still dealing with the question of stores as if you were an island without an empire at all. We are told that you are to have store-houses in different parts of the United Kingdom, and at one place in Ireland. I do not think it is sufficient at all to localise all your stores and supplies in the four corners of this United Kingdom. I wish to point out a most important matter. My hon. friend has shown that it would take so many years of the producing power we possess to bring up our store-houses to the standard we ought to maintain. He calculates it upon the amount required for three army corps, and the line of communication. But that is only calculated for the forces of the United Kingdom. All over the Empire, in any great war which this is supposed to be preparation for, you would have to place troops. Where are your stores to come from? You are calculating as if there was nothing outside the United Kingdom at all.

MR. WYNDHAM: I do not feel justified in going into details in this matter, but I can assure the hon. Gentleman that it has been considered.

*SIR J. COLOMB: I do not like to see this question treated as if we were still an island and not an Empire. A matter that must be looked in the face is the present limitation of your productive power for armaments and stores to the United Kingdom only. Has the War Office in its mind that we ought to distribute the producing power? With your great colonies and great possessions you must extend your productive power in proportion to your needs. Why is it to be bottled up in this island? If you are going to deal with the future of the Empire, you must look abroad not merely for places to store supplies, but for places to produce them. Except in India, and to a small extent in Canada, you cannot produce a cartridge outside the United Kingdom. That is an unsatisfactory position, and it is not consistent with your exist-

ence as an Empire. It is the devolution of your producing power and the distribution of your storage that in these days are most important. I for one regard the matter as one of great significance. We have heard to-day that the War Office at last is going to establish a system by which sufficient surplus stores will be maintained, but we shall not know till next year whether it will become a regular system.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): I do not mean to detain the Committee more than a few minutes. I wish at once to say that, as far as I am aware, there will be no objection to the Vote of money which the right hon. Gentleman has demanded. Although it is not easy to follow in all its details the statement he made in his analysis of the military expenditure, yet I think that, on the whole, the country will be satisfied with it and with the general estimate that he has formed. He laid great stress, and very naturally, on, perhaps, the most ambitious part of his scheme, and that which was most in the way of pledging the future—namely, the forming of considerable reserve stores. I entirely agree with that policy, if it is done, of course, as he said, with discretion and wisdom. He named one or two formidable considerations that must be taken into account—first of all, the question of the perishable nature of stores, and then the question of the power of manufacture, which may vary from year to year almost in some cases. There is another point—which I think, perhaps, he includes in the term perishable—namely, change of pattern. That is a very formidable matter, and although it is very much at the discretion of the military authorities themselves, still they may themselves sometimes by their own action, and very properly and of necessity, render comparatively useless a large portion of the stores they have obtained. All these things make it by no means so easy a matter as it would seem to follow out the plan which the hon. Gentleman has sketched. But I have no doubt at all that something in that direction ought to be done. The hon. Gentleman directed our attention almost entirely to that side of the question—to the financial effect of the War Estimates that we have had laid before us, and to this question of the future reserve of stores. But what the country is more concerned about just now—I agree with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Forest of Dean in that—is as to the war itself and the circumstances and events of the war. I quite appreciate that it is a difficult matter to discuss events of that kind in the House of Commons. Unfortunately, what we complain of is that we have no opportunity of discussion and, perhaps, of distinguishing ourselves by expressing very summary and badly-founded opinions regarding matters. As representatives of the nation we are at least entitled to know what the events were. In that respect I think that the House of Commons and the public at large have never been so badly informed as they have been during this war. The hon. Member, with regard to the despatches of which we have spoken so much, has been in the habit of answering questions in a way that has amazed me. He seemed to think that it was a complete answer when an hon. Member asked for the production of a certain despatch to say, "I cannot really, by an answer in this House, fetter the discretion of the Secretary of State." But he is the Secretary of State so far as this House is concerned. He has no *raison d'être* here except as representing the Secretary of State. For him to say that he must reserve that for the discretion of the Secretary of State, is to say that he reserves it for his own discretion. Clearly we cannot be put off with such palpable fallacy as that. The House of Commons is entitled to have the information contained in the despatches laid before it earlier, when it is not positively prejudicial to the public service that it should be done. Something has been said as to the censorship. I think there are a great many Members of the House of Commons who want to know a little more of the censorship. I have often said, in speaking on this subject, that I recognise the necessity of closing the sources of information against our enemies, though all the censors we have had in operation have not been successful in doing that in this case. But I think we are to know who are the officers who discharge the duty of censorship, because they go very far beyond military facts and the distribution of troops. They go into matters of opinion. That is a thing which is

abhorrent to the people of this country. There are other characteristics, such as the blotting out of whole sheets of a newspaper. I have seen this process applied by this so-called censorship. They were on matters of no consequence. I have known one or two cases where actual business messages have been refused for transmission on account of the censorship. The hon. Gentleman is responsible for the military censors, although he does not direct their operations, and we should like to know who they are, under what rules they act, and the nature of their instructions. We should also like to know whether it is owing to those instructions that their operations have been carried to an extent they have never been carried before, either in the Crimean War or in any other big war. In consequence of that, we are undoubtedly in a state of ignorance as to certain outstanding events in the campaign with which we ought to have been fully acquainted. Now we are told that there will be a great inquiry at the end of the war; but the worst of an inquiry at the end of a war is that all interest in it has evaporated. It was my misfortune to be a member of the Committee which inquired into the conduct of the Abyssinian War, and it was like sitting on a coroner's inquest on a man who had been dead twenty or thirty years to find out why he had died. It was very unpleasant, and the result was positively nothing. It was in every way disagreeable to the members of the Committee, and of no use whatever to the country. We were promised at the beginning of the session that there should be an inquiry. Hon. Members will recall the circumstances under which me met. We met under the cloud of certain reverses, and there was an idea that there would be a demand for an immediate inquiry into the conduct of the campaign, the generals and what not. The hon. Gentleman who moved the Address used these words—

"We wish to examine and investigate the causes of the reverses and the failures, if they may be so called, which have occurred in our campaign. I am here, perhaps, on delicate ground, but I think I may say this: we may ask ourselves with advantage whether our weakness or our failures, if I may use that word, are due to any deep-seated and inherent national weakness, or to temporary and removable causes. I think the latter can only be the answer. The Empire and the resources of the nation were never stronger than at this moment, but our power does not lie on the surface—it is deep seated; and the causes which we have to inquire into, if they are temporary and removable, must be inquired into with the view to their being removed. I feel sure that no obstacle will be thrown in the way, but that the Government will welcome inquiry in any form which may be agreeable to the House, and which will enable us to discover the causes of the difficulty and to remove them."

The hon. Gentleman who moved the Address had not been without communication with the Government, and these are obviously words put into his hand to say, because no one would venture to say off his own bat that the Government would welcome inquiry. He does not doubt it. I have not the slightest doubt that the Government suggested he should say so. That was really and practically a promise on the part of the Government. I have other quotations here of what took place in the House of Lords on a similar occasion, but I do not think I need quote. The hon. Gentleman has assented again and again to the demand of the right hon. Baronet the Member for Forest of Dean that an inquiry should be made into all the circumstances which he recounted. We want to know in what way is this inquiry to be conducted. As my right hon. friend said, we do not want the military authorities out there to be worried about matters of this kind. What we complain of is want of information. If blame is to be apportioned, and if we are to have such an inquiry as will lead us to discover what the serious reverses may have been due to, what will the nature of the inquiry be? I quite agree that an inquiry will be necessary. I think it ought not to be too long delayed. I feel sure that it will be necessary, not only for the satisfaction of the public, not simply for the satisfaction of idle curiosity and the appeasement of those whose feelings have been interested in the matter; but still more—and this is much more important in the view of the House of Commons—in order that the country should know where is the weak point, or what are the weak points, and what it is we should address ourselves to rectify for the future benefit of the Army.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER (Belfast, W.): I hope there will be some really effective inquiry into the matters which have been referred to in the course of the debate. Of course, I do not desire, and I do not think anyone desires, that it should take the form of an inquiry by newspapers, or that it should be anything but a military

inquiry; but it is *prima facie* right to assume that it is a disgraceful thing for British soldiers with arms in their hands to surrender. It is a presumption which may be rebutted, but until it is rebutted it exists. I think it is perhaps true that it would be a good thing if we were to come back to the spirit which certainly was much more common in the country formerly than it appears to be now. I remember the story of Admiral Calder, who sailed out of Portsmouth with a fleet of rotten ships, engaged a superior French fleet, fought them to a standstill, and took four ships. There was a court-martial, and he was severely reprimanded for not taking the whole fleet. That is a much more satisfactory spirit than the spirit in which, I fear, we have approached some of the incidents of this campaign. Although it is rather presumptuous for anyone here to express opinions as to the merits and demerits of men who are risking their lives, I think it is a fair and reasonable thing in the interest of the British Army, whose reputation for bravery is so splendid and so high, that there should be an inquiry—not an inquiry into everything in general and nothing in particular, but a definite and specific inquiry into the surrenders which have taken place. I accept the assurance in the fullest way of my hon. friend that such an inquiry will be held, and that it will be effective. I accept also with the greatest satisfaction the statement of my hon. friend that we are to have a great reconstruction of the system of supplying stores for the Army. I confess that I wish the House of Commons in its majesty was more largely represented than it is at the present moment. I think it is rather unfortunate that there should be such small interest taken in what ought to be the most important discussion of military matters of the present year, because I think, unless the country understands how important the statement made by the Under Secretary is, it will very much miss the lesson it ought to learn. I think it is fair that we should ask for a little more than the assurance that has been given. We want some security as to the nature of the reforms to be made, and I think I can give some evidence which warrants me in feeling some doubt on the subject. The question of stores is not a new one at all. On 12th February, this year, Lord Lansdowne, speaking on this question in the House of Lords, said—

> "My Lords, among our other proposals now being carried out is one dealing with the question of the stores and munitions of war of all kinds. As to that, I do not think I need say any more than that we have adopted it for our policy not only to replace the large inroads which have been made upon our stores of all sorts, but also to build up the reserves upon a much ampler scale than has hitherto been authorised. We have been struck by the inadequacy of our reserves of stores, and we are determined that we shall no longer be open to that reproach."

That is a very serious statement. This deficiency may have been a new fact to the Secretary of State, but I will undertake to say that it was not a new fact to any one of us. It has been a perfectly notorious fact inside and outside the House for many years past, and I say that when we are told merely that this policy is to be reversed, we require more details in order to make us perfectly happy. It appears to me inexplicable that the Secretary of State, after six years of office, should be allowed without protest to get up and make a statement of that kind in the House of Lords. It appears to me intolerable that a great State servant, speaking in regard to a matter respecting which the country has entrusted him with absolute power, should, after six years of office, get up and say, "We have been struck by the inadequacy of our reserves of stores." What is the deficiency? My hon. friend talks about £6,500,000. I venture to think that even this does not represent the whole measure of neglect. Let us turn that deficiency into what the money is going to buy. It represents a deficiency of nearly 600 guns alone, and nothing, so far as I am aware, has happened in the last year, or the last few months, which has altered the situation with regard to the necessity for guns except what was known beforehand must happen, and what has been proved to demonstration by the progress of the war. We are told that we are to have other great changes. We are told that the Militia is to be put on a better footing. We have all been hoping for that for a long time, but what guarantee have we? I find that the Secretary of State for War, speaking of the Militia in the House of Lords on 20th February said—

> "The Militia is below its establishment, and nobody regrets it more than I do. But it has been more or less below its establishment for many years past. We are no worse in that

respect than we were last year or the year before."

For six years past the Secretary of State, it appears, has been regretting that the Militia is 30,000 below its strength. This is not a new thing. What has he done? Nothing, absolutely nothing, during that time to amend the error he so greatly deplores. I think we want something more than an assurance, because what has turned this regret into an active policy has been not conviction or intelligence, but simply the pressure of this war. The noble Lord the Secretary of State for War was recently attacked in the House of Lords for allowing filthy clothing to be supplied to the Militia. This seems, perhaps, to be a matter of detail not bearing on any great principle, but it is an example of what is done. The facts were represented to him by the Duke of Bedford, and the Secretary of State said—

"Then we come to the delicate question of Militia clothing. I am not surprised that the statement made by the noble Duke produced a very considerable impression upon your Lordships, and I must say that if it were to be shown to be the case that worn clothing, dirty and disreputable in its character, was re-issued to the Militia, I do not think the language used by the noble Duke was at all too strong. I should be very glad to have any allegations that he brings to my notice thoroughly gone into."

These allegations were inquired into, and a few days later we are told—

"I come to the question of the clothing of the Militia. I promised the Duke of Bedford that I would make inquiry into the subject, and I admit that, as a result of the inquiries I have made, I am satisfied that in the matter of clothing we have allowed what I suppose I might call considerations of frugality to prevail rather too much, and that clothing has been issued to the Militia which one could scarcely ask a British soldier to wear without some injury to his feelings of self-respect. Action will be taken without loss of time to remedy that grievance, and I will undertake that in the future clothing shall be issued to the force which shall make it impossible for any colonel to make such a complaint as that which was made by the noble Duke the other evening."

What is the lesson to be drawn from this? The complaint has been made by many other Militia colonels. Why is the matter now remedied? Because the Militia is brought under the public eye and because this demand was made in the House of Lords by a noble Duke. This example is one of scores in which the antiquated and unsatisfactory nature of the Militia clothing has been insisted upon in season and out of season, and yet the Secretary of State for War has done nothing to remedy the state of things which he now admits is incompatible with the British soldier having any proper feeling of self respect. Yet the noble Lord has been in office for the last six years, and has had the power to alter all this, but not a hand's-turn has he done to remedy these defects. A good many of us have deplored the fearful waste of the present system of the Army, and, apparently, we have not been alone in doing so. Upon the 25th May the Secretary for War also deplored it. He said in another place—

"To my mind one of the greatest drawbacks in our present system is to be found in the fact that of the men who do enter the Army so large a number waste away and disappear in the first years of their service, giving us neither the full period of their service with the colours nor the advantage of their presence afterwards in the Reserve."

That is a doctrine which has been preached in season and out of season for the last five years, but it has had not the slightest effect. No notice has been taken in this House, but now it is admitted that it is one of the greatest evils of the present system, by the Secretary for War. Let me give yet one more example of the extraordinary attitude of this great official who is established in his office to carry out the plain duty of spending the millions entrusted to him to procure the best defence for the country. He was asked the other day by the Duke of Bedford how it was we had so many soldiers at home who were useless. He said—

"I told the House that we had about 100,000 Regular soldiers left in this country, and he said, 'Why is it if you have so many Regulars at home that you are obliged to fall back upon the Militia, and to send out Militia battalions to South Africa?' I think the answer is obvious, and that from the tenor of the noble Duke's remarks, he knows what the answer is. These men—they now number not 100,000 but 92,000—are, of course, in no sense a field army."

Have we been paying millions in order to have in this country 92,000 men who are in no sense a field army? These men are perfectly useless—they are provided with neither guns, stores, nor clothing; it is all quite true. But why should we be told we have a large number of men in this country so useless that we have to fall back upon the Militia? These are samples of the way in which these duties are performed, or rather left unperformed. In any other business but the great business of the State a declaration of that

kind, after a long period of service, by the head of a great department would have resulted in some other head being sought for and put in his place. I am unable to comprehend how a Minister can get up in the House of Lords and make such statements as if they were quite the ordinary thing to say and could not possibly be objected to? I do not blame Lord Lansdowne only. None of the Secretaries for War of recent years have taken their duties seriously, and until we change the whole attitude of the War Office by some drastic reform, I must treat the promises made this evening as having no value beyond mere expression of good intentions. There is one special matter which indicates the necessity for giving effect to a reform of the War Office of a sweeping character. When we consider the dangers that threaten us in every part of the world, the problems we have to face, and the lessons we have learnt, or might have learnt, from the present war in South Africa, it is positively dreadful to remember that there is no Department of State — no organised Department — in the country to which is entrusted the duty of organising the defence of this country. I challenge anyone to contradict my statement, and I say there could not be a more serious state of things for this country. The protection of the Empire by land and sea is a problem far more difficult than that which confronts the War Office of any other country in the world. It is a problem peculiar to our Empire, and being peculiar it requires special study. But who is charged to deal with it? The Intelligence Department is a small, underpaid, and undermanned Department; in no sense does it pretend to be an organised Department for the defence of the Empire. There is no co-ordination at all between the different Departments for the defence of the Empire. The hon. and gallant Member for Great Yarmouth said something about the desirability of getting some uniformity in the supply of stores, and my hon. friend said the Indian stores were already complete. Take the Indian stores. Only this session we had proof of the failure of one point of contact between the Indian War Office and our own. And this may lead to the most disastrous results. I was told that the Indian Government and the War Office were unable to come to terms. I asked a question, and the answer given was so illusory and absurd that I almost wonder that it was given at all. It was a question as to the pattern of some guns. There were two sets of guns made of different patterns, not because it was desirable to have two different kinds, but simply because one strong man said he must have a 5·4 howitzer, and another strong man said he must have a 5-inch, and there was no Department to compel these men to agree. With regard to Imperial defence. One sham creates another, and this appears to be so with regard to the Committee of the Cabinet for Defence. That Committee, we are told, never keeps minutes. Why? Because, forsooth, it is a Committee of the Cabinet. The Cabinet itself is a constitutional fiction, and this Committee in its turn is a fiction also. Any person that wrote a book on the subject would have to say—"The only body charged with the defence of the Empire is composed of the head of the Education Department, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the First Lord of the Treasury, the Secretary of State for War, and the First Lord of the Admiralty, and this body, which is alone charged with the great duty of organising the defence of the Empire, can get through this enormous work, in addition to all its other business, without going through the formality which a lodge of Oddfellows would go through, and which every company does go through. It does not keep minutes of its proceedings." I believe that my hon. friend will endeavour, so far as he is concerned, to carry out the promises which he has made, but I fear he will not be able to accomplish half that he promises. Until we have a proper organisation for the defence of the Empire, promises to do what is the primary business of any War Office are of no great value. Some system ought to be introduced which will not leave us open to a repetition of these painful demands on the part of the Secretary of State for War, who has been compelled to acknowledge, after a long period of peace, that he has failed during that period to do any of the things which he now declares to be essential.

*Sir WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston): I see a considerable amount of money is being devoted to the medical establishment and to pay and materials

for strengthening the medical department of the Army. That is a question very much in the mind of the public just now, and I hope before the conclusion of the debate we shall have some detailed statement as to how this money is to be applied, what improvement is to be made in the Army Medical Corps, and how it is proposed to reinforce the medical department in South Africa. At the present time the medical department in South Africa is composed of two sections of medical men—the Royal Army Medical Corps and civil surgeons. With regard to the civil surgeons who have been sent out, I think the War Office to some extent was limited somewhat unwisely in its choice. There was an age limit which was not altogether wisely chosen, by which many valuable practitioners and experienced men were debarred from the duty, for, after all, it was men of established experience who were wanted rather than men fresh from the hospitals who might know more of surgery but less of medicine. We have sent out to South Africa many men of considerable ability and distinction, but I think the War Office would have been better advised if they had widened their area of choice, and selected men of greater age and experience than many who have been sent out. With regard to the Royal Army Medical Corps, the hon. Member will be obliged to confess that the strength of that corps is at present dangerously low. I said in a previous debate that it was dangerously low even for a peace establishment, and at the present time it is only about 900 strong. There ought to be considerably more than that. About fifteen or twenty years back there were 1,200 medical men in the corps, but now it is down to 900. The Royal Army Medical Corps is so diminished in numbers, and the force is so starved as regards medical equipment that if we sent out a division, or a part of a division, to China, and a German division of the same strength was sent out, it would be found that the German division had probably 50 per cent. more medical strength than our division. That is a condition of things discreditable to the country. The country has shown the greatest generosity both in voting supplies in this House and in giving freely of its private funds for the purpose of seeing that the men who went to fight for the Empire were well treated. The men have not been as well treated as they deserved; we have lost many hundreds of brave fellows through the want of proper medical appliances, and I am anxious that the money which is voted to-day should be applied in a direction which will ensure for these men more attention than they have hitherto received. I should like the hon. Member to tell us how much of this Vote as regards medical matters is to be devoted to China, and how much to South Africa. In China we have a great danger before us, just as we had in connection with the South African campaign. Everybody who knew anything about South Africa knew that almost every village in which the troops might be stationed or kept for a few days was liable to typhoid fever, and yet adequate preparation to meet that danger was not made. When we send our troops to China we shall have there a danger even more serious and loathsome than enteric or typhoid—namely, the danger of the plague. Our troops in China will be exposed to sanitary dangers of the gravest kind, and I hope the War Office will be wise enough to take some precautions against an outbreak of such a serious disease, or at all events to minimise the danger as much as possible. I should also like to know what is proposed in regard to increasing the number of nurses in connection with the Army Medical Department. I think the rigid rules regulating the number of female nurses in connection with that Department are unwise; they ought to be more elastic; the whole constitution of the Department should be more elastic. When you have a campaign in a country where you are liable to a lingering malady such as enteric fever, which, above all maladies, requires the delicate and constant attention of female nurses, we ought to have some means by which there could be a much larger number connected with the Army Medical Department. Enteric is a disease which is not only grave in its incidence, killing at least one-fifth of those attacked, but it disables even those who get over it for about three months. That is a terrible strain on the fighting force of our Army, and going on as it has been in South Africa with thousands and thousands of cases, and in almost every place occupied, we ought to have such nursing at hand that the men may make as quick and as speedy a recovery as possible. It would be very advisable to institute some system by which we could have a reserve Army Medical Corps in this country for the

purposes of a war such as we are now engaged in. It would not be difficult, I think, to get a large number of young medical men who would be ready under easy conditions to accept service in case of national necessity. You might get, possibly, many hundreds of the pick of our medical schools enrolled under some system by which the War Office would be able to call upon them in time of necessity, and that would be much better than looking for a surgeon here and a surgeon there in various parts of the country when the time of stress came. Then there is another point. I believe that in all these matters prevention is better than cure, and that when an army goes into the field the means of preventing disease are much more important than the means of treating it. In the case of the present war the War Office reinforced the Army Medical Department with operating surgeons. That was a wise step, which was generally approved; but they would have taken a still wiser step if they had reinforced the Department with a number of physicians in the same way. There was more necessity for such men under the conditions of disease which exist in South Africa, and the department would have been greatly helped by the experience of men who had been attached to the fever hospitals of this country. More attention should be paid to the sanitary aspects of a campaign. It is true that the military medical officers are trained more or less in sanitary science; it is true that some of the best text-books on the subject have been written by Army medical officers. But in spite of that, judging from the results of this campaign, we cannot consider that their efforts as sanitary experts have been satisfactory. We have had disclosures as to the treatment of the sick; we have had evidence as to the outbreaks of great epidemics of typhoid fever, which might have been lessened and many lives saved if wiser sanitary arrangements had been made. I am told on the authority of friends of mine who have been through this campaign, that over and over again troops marching to the front have been allowed to camp on ground which has been left by previous detachments and fouled very often by serious disease, such as typhoid fever. The consequence is that body after body of men have come under conditions which made disease rife among the troops. These things would have been prevented if you had wise sanitary supervision along the line of march. I want to have sanitary supervision not going ahead of, but with the Army. I am sure if the hon. Gentleman can see his way to carry out the suggestions I have made he will do something to preserve the lives of many of the Queen's best subjects, and he will give the country the great satisfaction of knowing that the brave sons who are sent out to fight its battles are not to be lost by the neglect of such scientific precautions as ought to be at the command of every medical officer in the country.

*Mr. BURDETT-COUTTS (Westminster): I rise to say a few words on the subject to which the hon. Member has just addressed himself, but I should like first to refer to the censorship. No one can realise better than I do the necessity of striking out from correspondence or telegrams anything that could in any way affect the strategic or military interests of the Army, but I do not think that those limits include statements with regard to the condition of the sick and wounded. A short time ago there was a facsimile of a despatch from a correspondent published in a morning paper, and several sentences which he had inserted with regard to the unhappy condition of the wounded were deliberately obliterated by the censor. I know another case in which a long despatch was written on the same subject, and the whole of that letter was censored. A somewhat amusing incident happened to me out there. A telegram was sent to me—a domestic telegram—written in Italian, and containing some such phrase as "*tempo magnifico*" or "*dolce giorno.*" It was detained twenty-four hours while the censor was endeavouring to find out what horrid foreign plot was being hatched. May I point out what I think is a great mistake with regard to the censor. The same official who censors despatches has the whole control of the movements of the correspondents. He controls their passes, can give them orders, tell them where they can go, how long they can stay, and altogether exercise the most draconic authority over them. The two offices ought to be separate; the striking out of what is not considered proper in a despatch should be done by one person, and the

movements of correspondents controlled by another. If that were done there could be no suggestion of a correspondent being prejudiced by anything he had put in a telegram. Moreover, the censor should be a military man. My own experience is that when civilians get into khaki they out-Herod Herod in militarism. They are the counterparts of the gentlemen who stay at home and indulge in vicarious heroism, and who think they are very brave when they say that the British soldier ought to endure every possible hardship whether it is avoidable or not. I listened to the very able speech of the Under Secretary of State for War, and I noticed that in his division of this money into expenditure for immediate and for permanent purposes he did not give any information about this very large additional Vote for the Army Medical Department. The right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean referred to the cutting down of the transport of the Royal Army Medical Corps, but I think the real point is that the Department does not possess any transport of its own, and without transport of its own it never knows what it can do, what it will be able to do, and is never able to make proper preparation for pressure in this place or that. I would venture to illustrate this fact by the very remarkable service that has been performed in this campaign by the medical units which had their own transport. One was the private hospital known as the Irish hospital. Owing to having its own transport that hospital was of the greatest possible service; at Bloemfontein it supplied nearly the whole of the transport, and the ambulance wagons and mules were constantly at work for the Government hospitals and the town and field hospitals. A still more remarkable case was that of the New South Wales field hospital and bearer company, which was found to be so efficient and so valuable that it was broken up from time to time into three or four units, and was looked to in every emergency. One of its great advantages was that it had its own transport, and consequently was always ready to go where it was wanted, and to do work which other medical units were unable to do. With regard to these extra stores, I think it is legitimate to ask what proportion of them are to be medical stores. The Committee may not quite understand the position of the Army Medical Department or the Royal Army Medical Corps in a campaign in this respect. The Royal Army Medical Corps possesses nothing of its own except medicines and drugs. It has to draw the whole of its transport, food supplies, and so on from the Army Service Corps and the whole of its equipment from the Ordnance Department. It would be interesting, therefore, to know whether the necessary equipment for the Royal Army Medical Corps forms a part of these extra ordnance stores. I do not myself think that the difficulties and the, to my mind, disastrous results which have arisen in South Africa in connection with the medical service have been caused so much by an absence of equipment as by an absence of men. Everybody who has been out there—every consulting surgeon and other authority—has called attention to the fact that the Royal Army Medical Corps has been fatally undermanned. To that fact has been owing the circumstance that great numbers of the sick could not get proper attention. The service has been undermanned in doctors, in orderlies, and in nurses. It is, therefore, fair to ask whether anything is to be done with the portion of this Vote which is for permanent purposes, to secure a better state of things for the future in the Army Medical Department. Although I realise that the Army Medical Department is too small, I do not make so much of that. I quite realise that it is perfectly impossible to maintain in time of peace an Army Medical Department equal to the strain of a great war, and, therefore, you must have some system whereby you can at any moment, when occasion arises, call for skilled aid, whether it be of doctors, orderlies, or nurses. My great complaint has been that there is no such system in the Department at all; there is no system of reserve; there is no effective system of an auxiliary medical force attached to the Militia or to the Volunteers, although there is a small beginning of a Militia medical system. In this connection I would like again to refer to the New South Wales field hospital. That magnificent medical unit, so splendidly equipped and disciplined, and able to meet the greatest emergencies at the front, was composed entirely of civilians. Some of the most famous Australian doctors gave their services voluntarily, giving up the large incomes they were deriving from their practices in order to serve in the field. It seems to me that if a medical

service of that kind could be established through the machinery of the Militia, with a month's training and field days now and again, that would be a model upon which might be based a very effective improvement of the Army Medical Department. There is no practical elasticity about the Department. Putting aside the question of the Militia and the Volunteers, they have no system by which they can call upon carefully selected medical men for the purpose of sending them out to a campaign. As to orderlies, I think it would be very difficult for any system to create a sufficient number of nursing orderlies to meet the needs of a great war. There are the St. John Ambulance orderlies, and very admirable work they have done in this campaign. But it must be remembered that they have no practical training of any kind, and the general opinion in the Army Medical Department is that it takes at least six weeks to accustom even a theoretically trained St. John Ambulance man to the efficient handling of a patient. I have heard Army medical officers say that it takes three years to train a nursing orderly properly. No system of theoretically trained orderlies will supply what you want in time of war. What is the alternative? If you cannot keep a large number of men nurses in time of peace ready and sufficiently skilled to go out to a war, you have always at your disposal female nurses all over the country, and one of my great complaints has been that, starting from a theoretical and very obstinate objection to female nurses in the Department at home, there has not been anything like a sufficient supply of nurses to meet the cases of sickness and enteric fever. I think that objection in the Army Medical Department at home ought to be erased. We ought to accept at once, in any campaign carried on in a civilised country such as South Africa, where women are respected in every way, the principle of having a very large number of female nurses certainly at the base and stationary hospitals. The Boers themselves have female nurses in their field hospitals, and very admirable nurses they seemed. I do not, however, insist on female nurses going with field hospitals, but I do think they ought to be with field hospitals when they become stationary hospitals. The lack of elasticity in the system can be best illustrated by looking for a moment at one of the base hospitals at Cape Town. Military base hospitals are very admirable institutions, but it must be remembered that each one has a staff of 166 men, including doctors. These base hospitals are strategically safe. If there was any elasticity in the working of the system, when the pressure came the whole of the staff of a base hospital could be pushed up to the front where they are most needed, being trained men—Army medical surgeons, trained orderlies, men belonging to the military contingent—and their places could be supplied by putting in their tents a completely civilian institution. There would have to be two or three officers and a small staff at the head to keep up communications with the military authorities, but all that concerned the medical and surgical treatment of the patients could be done as well by a civil as by a military staff. I might illustrate the point further by referring to the private hospitals sent out to South Africa. There were eight or nine such hospitals, and each, with the exception of one Army medical officer to keep up their connection with the military system and to send in the returns, was a purely civil institution. Would it not be as possible for the Army Medical Department as for private persons to create and to send out a civil institution such as that? I have ventured to make these few remarks to the Committee to indicate the line which I think the expenditure of money now to be voted for permanent as distinguished from immediate purposes should take, and I think I may be pardoned for urging upon the Committee some improvements of the system which would, at all events, result in having at the seat of war a sufficient *personnel* to avoid much of such suffering as has occurred in the present campaign.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I regret we have not had some definite announcement as to the steps the Secretary of State proposes to take in order to profit by the lessons of the war. I understood the Under-Secretary to say it was premature to do anything of the kind until Lord Roberts, Lord Kitchener, and other generals came home. A very large number of officers are coming home now, and it is perfectly certain that Lord Roberts has written full despatches on many of the incidents of the war, and

there are many facts concerning the campaign which are absolutely well known. The teaching on those points could perfectly well be put into operation. I very much hoped that a Committee would be appointed to receive suggestions from all arms taking part in the campaign, without distinction of rank. It would be a large business, but it would not be difficult to tabulate evidence of that character, and some very important testimony might possibly be forthcoming. If such a Committee could be under a civilian chairman it would perhaps be better, so long as every arm was represented on the body. There are one or two matters about which I think we ought to lose no time. I was disappointed at not hearing any definite announcement as to the better provision of field guns. It is perfectly certain that in several cases our artillery has been outranged, and the sooner our field artillery is put upon the very latest modern system the better for the country. Then as to the armament of the infantry. There can be very little doubt that in many ways the Mauser rifle is the superior of the Lee-Metford. To take one point alone, the Boer rifle is superior with regard to the way in which the magazine is charged. The whole of the five cartridges are put in at once with one clip, while there is nothing more difficult to the inexperienced soldier, especially in the heat of action, than to load the magazine of the Lee-Metford rifle. Then as regards musketry training. Are we profiting by the musketry and shooting lessons of the war? We already have another war on our hands, and what is the use of delay in this matter? There is ample evidence now forthcoming as to many of the defective points in our musketry training. The National Rifle Association is not connected with the Government, but only last week they had competitions for standing at 200 or 300 yards—as if there was the slightest possibility of standing in the face of an enemy at that distance! Then again, there is the practice of the Army at the present time. The right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean, who made a most interesting and moderate speech, with a great deal, if not the whole, of which I entirely agree, doubted whether the training at the present time at Aldershot had been improved at all by the lessons taught by the war in South Africa. To take musketry alone; nothing is more certain than that firing by volleys is absolutely ineffectual. The rifles are discharged at word of command, and the object is to have spontaneity of noise rather than accuracy of shooting. That practice is actually continuing at the present moment. It is perfectly impossible for expert marksmen to fire accurately at word of command. With every desire to give all credit to the War Office —and no one is more anxious than Lord Lansdowne to do everything possible to improve the Army—I really do not see any substantial evidence that any of the lessons of the war are being put into effect at the present time. The right hon. Baronet spoke about entrenchments. At Aldershot there is one wretched field, a sort of rubbish field, to which the battalions are supposed to go in turn, if there is room for them, to learn how to throw up a trench. That is not proper instruction of any sort or kind. I am quite aware there have been difficulties. Government land is limited, and even on Government land there are many restrictions designed rather to improve the beauty and character of the country than to effect an improvement in military training. There can be no doubt whatever that at Spion Kop our troops were hopelessly outmatched by the Boers in the matter of entrenchments. They find themselves really without instructions and without proper tools for entrenching. If you take the present drill-book you will find plates illustrating shelter trenches in which the soldier is represented as showing the whole of his head, his shoulders, and the greater part of his body over the top. It is perfectly obvious that if you show the smallest tip of your head, the probability is that you will be shot. I see very little, if any, instruction in the important matter of entrenching being carried out. The same applies to scouting. I know that instruction in scouting requires a great area of country. The Germans can have much better training in scouting because they have much larger areas to go over, and in case of damage to private property they pay only nominal compensation. I know there is considerable difficulty in the matter, but the one complaint from every general in South Africa, from Sir Redvers Buller downwards, has been about the scouting. There is no necessity to wait for the return of Lord Roberts in the matter of cavalry and mounted infantry training in regard to scouting. I would

ask the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Forest of Dean not to place too much confidence in what German writers say about the conduct of the war in South Africa.

*Sir CHARLES DILKE: I fully admitted that they were written with prejudice, except in the case of Generals von Blume and von der Goltz.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT: The information of these German writers has been largely derived from the Boers, and therefore, as the hon. Baronet admits, it comes from prejudiced sources. No German officers have ever had to conduct a campaign in so difficult and vast a country as South Africa, and it is almost impossible for them to form any idea of the extraordinary military difficulties which had to be faced. Therefore, we should not pay much attention to theoretical military criticism from Berlin, and from people not acquainted with the local conditions. I am quite sure that—with all respect to the German writers—the right hon. Baronet will be the first to admit that the majority of those writers have never seen any active service at all, and therefore their statements must be taken with a very large grain of salt. I earnestly press upon my hon. friend the necessity of making reforms in the training of the British soldiers, and those reforms should be instituted at once. When the war is over we must profit by the lessons of this war, and we know perfectly well that unless these things are done at once they never will be done at all. I cannot resume my seat without saying a word or two as regards the censorship. I should not be at all surprised if the newspaper correspondents said they had suffered from the censorship. I know something about this question in foreign campaigns, and perhaps the best censorship I ever knew was by the Russian army in the advance upon Turkey in 1877. The censors there were people of considerable experience, and they were always to be found in their office. You could always find them when you wanted them, and there was no difficulty about it. In South Africa, no doubt, the censors have been constantly changed, and whenever anybody wanted something to do, and there was nothing particular to give him, they made him a press censor. I know of one case where the newspaper correspondents were put to considerable inconvenience by the censor never being in his office when he had said he would be there in order to revise telegrams. I think the hon. Member for Westminster was a little in error in saying that there was any censorship of letters.

Mr. BURDETT-COUTTS: Yes, there was.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT: Private or newspaper letters?

*Mr. BURDETT-COUTTS: Newspaper letters.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT: I know that when Lord Roberts got out to South Africa he sent for the newspaper correspondents, and he said to them, practically, "Write what you like, because it is by your writings that I shall see what mistakes have been made." The relations between Lord Roberts and the newspaper correspondents have always been of the most cordial description. If there has been any censorship of newspaper letters I have not heard of them, and I know that there has been very free criticism in many of the letters sent by the newspaper correspondents for the *Daily Telegraph*, *The Times*, and other papers. As for the censorship of private letters or telegrams, I never heard of it while I was out in South Africa. You can understand such telegrams as those to which my hon. friend the Member for Westminster alluded being delayed, because that was obviously a cypher telegram.

*Mr. BURDETT-COUTTS: No, no.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT: The telegraph office were justified in assuming that it was, at any rate.

*Mr. BURDETT-COUTTS: It was a telegram in very simple and elementary Italian.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT: It was in a foreign language, and that is perhaps why there was delay in sending it off. I want to ask one other question. The Under Secretary will remember that when the last Estimates were on a wish was expressed by hon. Members on both this and the other side of the House that greater mobility should be given to the regiments at home. My hon. friend expressed great sympathy in the matter, and he said it was perfectly absurd that there

should be such an enormous amount of baggage when the regiments were moved from one station to another. I see that there is £100,000 in this Supplementary Estimate for transport in the United Kingdom. I hope the hon. Gentleman will be able to tell us now that he has translated his sympathy into actual practice, and that something is being done. How necessary it is that this should be done no one knows better than the hon. Gentleman himself. The heavy cost of transfer from one command to another frequently prevents the most able general being sent to a particular district. To take over the Aldershot command costs something like £3,000. That is a scandalous thing, and it is clear that a general may be admirably fitted to train troops up to modern requirements, and yet he may not have the £3,000 which is necessary to furnish Government House at Aldershot, and to incur the heavy initial expense of taking up that command. If a general has just installed himself in a house at the cost of £3,000, if he has had to furnish it from top to bottom, naturally he is unwilling to be transferred to some other sphere of activity, and he has some just ground for complaint if the Government desire to transfer him to another station. I will not trouble the Committee further, but I hope my hon. friend in his reply will give some definite assurances that the lessons of this war will be taken to heart by the War Office and enforced throughout the Army.

MR. WASON (Clackmannan and Kinross): Most hon. Members who have spoken have dealt with the question of medical stores in the Army and with munitions of war. I wish to press upon the Under Secretary a question which, in my opinion, is quite as material as either good weapons or good medical equipment, and that is the proper feeding of our troops. I have to-day received two letters, but I shall not weary the Committee with reading the whole of them. They are from men at the front who are unknown to me, but they show that the troops have not been well looked after, and if they had had proper commissariat we should not have had the same amount of sickness. One of these letters is from a constituent of mine, whose son wrote to him as follows—

"I have had some strange experiences out here. What do you think! I have gone from door to door in some towns asking and begging for bread, and been thankful for a dry crust. I have gone for weeks on end with only one biscuit a day, sometimes without even that."

The hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary will recognise that these letters are at his disposal if he wishes to see them. The other letter is somewhat of the same nature and is to this effect—

"For the last month weariness and hunger have been the only sensations we have been capable of unless it is a surly dogged determination to see the thing through, which has helped our men along on their dreary foot-sore tramp, and has kept them in the ranks when sickness and fatigue would otherwise have forced them to fall out in sheer despair. It has been want of food that has been the heaviest burden we have had to bear. We were hungry after we left Winburg; we were hungrier still when we reached Kroonstad; but from Linley to Johannesburg we have been hungriest of all. For months we have had no bread, for many days no biscuit, and for the last few days before the battle of Florida Heights we have received no bread rations at all save a pinch or two per man of coarse ground mealie, which will not make dough, but can only be boiled into a gritty, tasteless, indigestible porridge."

I do not propose to read these letters at any greater length. Of course, nobody expects that, in a campaign such as we have been engaged in, the troops will not have to undergo some hardships, but I do say that if, instead of giving out this dough and flour, they had given oatmeal it would have had very excellent effects. If this had been done I think the health of our troops would have been far better than it has been through this campaign. I could have given many other instances, but I will refrain at present from giving any more extracts from letters which have reached me. I have received letters from quite independent sources in which they say that our troops have been half starved. If the troops had had oatmeal instead of this queer mealy stuff there would not have been the same necessity for the strain upon the Royal Army Medical Corps. I do hope the hon. Member the Under Secretary, who always listens with courtesy to any suggestions which are made, will see that sufficient oatmeal is sent out to South Africa to supply the troops.

*SIR J. FERGUSSON (Manchester, N.E.) said he should like to say one word in regard to what had fallen from the hon. Member opposite. He had given many details in regard to the hardships which the troops had undergone, but he thought it would be found on investigation that many of those hardships were

due to the unfortunate capture of convoys by the enemy. They all knew that in war such accidents would happen, and he did not think anybody would complain seriously of matters like that, which were purely the incidents of war. He thought they would be wasting the time of the Committee considering hardships which were inevitable, although if they were preventible and someone had blundered it would be a different matter. There must be minute inquiry into many of the incidents of this war. There was a general opinion that there had been many failures and much unnecessary loss of life in some of the initial stages of the campaign; indeed, it was difficult to understand how men high in authority, who had previous experience of war in South Africa, could have made certain recommendations as to the constitution of the force to be employed which surprised people less well informed. Those were matters which would no doubt be inquired into. It was impossible to imagine that earnest men in charge at the War Office would not take to heart the lessons of the war. He confessed that he could not share the words of depreciation thrown out against those charged with the heavy responsibility of this war. In the case of men like the Secretary of State for War, who had gained a high reputation in other very important positions, those charges would have belied his former history. He ventured to say that there had never been anyone in office in this country who had been more painstaking, more earnest, and more ready to hear suggestions from all quarters than the present Secretary of State for War. He believed his courage was equal to his patience and skill, and if they only considered how much had been accomplished by the War Office he thought they would be more inclined to make allowance for any shortcomings. At the same time he agreed with those who urged that their system must be largely remodelled, and that the country must be better prepared in the future for great emergencies than they had been in the past. It would never do for them again to send men out so hurriedly, and put them in uniform with arms which they did not know how to use. They should be better prepared in the future, and the lessons of this war must be taken to heart. With regard to the Army Medical Department, there could be no doubt that they had been short-handed. His hon. friend who represented the War Office had acknowledged that they had been short-handed, but it was to a large extent only for a time. Not only had they been short-handed, but the doctors had not been in the places where they would have been most useful, and there never was a time when the great change made in the composition of the Army Medical Department some years ago had been more clearly proved to be a mistake. Under the old system the medical officers used to gain a thorough knowledge of the regiments to which they were attached, and they knew exactly the requirements and the character of the men they had to deal with. It was only natural that medical men who were moved about from one regiment to another, who were here to-day and gone to-morrow, could never gain a thorough knowledge of the requirements of the regiments to which they were attached. That change was made in what had been described as the halcyon days when the Estimates were lower and when everything was pared down closely. He remembered the time when a saving on the Army Estimates was made at the last minute by reducing every company by ten men, but as the regiments were not up to establishment it only made a difference on paper. At the time many of them argued against this change in the composition of the Army Medical Department, and he did not believe there was a medical officer in the Army at the present time who would not say that the change was very much to be regretted. He had never met an officer who had anything to say in favour of this change; and what could be expected in the case of a regiment who went out on active service with medical men who had only lately joined them? He had very good reason to believe that very often some of the most necessary appliances in field hospitals were wanting, because the medical officers in charge of them were afraid to speak out. He had good reason to think that very often the deficiency in articles of the first necessity was due to the fact that the medical officers themselves knew that they would make themselves unpopular with their superior officers if they pressed for those articles. That would not be so if the medical officers had a settled position from which they could not be displaced except for some grave failure in their duty. He thought if the

Sir J. Fergusson.

inquiry to be held went deeply into this question, and if the medical officers engaged came forward and stated what they thought, he was sure it would be found that this was a weak spot in the Army Medical Department which would have to be obviated. No doubt to a great extent the Army Medical Department was on its trial in South Africa, and he should be surprised if it did not come out of it successfully, because it was largely composed of men who were anxious to do their duty, and who were ready to devote themselves at any sacrifice to carry out their work as well as they could. He believed that in nothing which Lord Lansdowne had done had he shown more wisdom than in the raising of the character of the Army Medical Department. No doubt the question would be dealt with courageously after this lamentable war had closed, and no pains would be spared to remedy those faults so that in time to come their gallant soldiers would have to suffer less than they had done in this campaign.

DR. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, W.) said he agreed with a good deal of what the hon. Member who had just sat down had said. As one who had served in the Army, he knew the ties which previously existed between the doctor and his regiment. Nevertheless, he concurred with the present arrangement because he thought it had been found that the old plan was quite unworkable under present modes of warfare, and the short service system rendered the old methods not so necessary. A doctor in the Army used to be expected to know exactly the constitutions of his patients, and he used to know who were the malingerers. Lord Lansdowne had raised the status of the Army Medical Corps by giving them their proper Army rank, and what had just been said bore that out. There was an impression that a simple doctor would not get such good terms for the men under his control as he would if he were a major or a captain; that if he had his proper rank he would get better terms in the field from the transport. He was in accord with the hon. Member for Westminster to some extent. The hon. Gentleman called attention to the starvation of the Army Medical Department. Those who had followed the debates in the House would be aware of the way in which the right hon. Member for the Forest of Dean, the hon. Member for West Belfast, and himself had, over and over again, pointed out the paucity of the ranks. When it was proposed to send out two army corps, it was pointed out there was not sufficient medical service for one. A good deal had been said as to the deficiency of nurses, but the hon. Member for Westminster did not give sufficient credit to the male nursing. Those male nurses might not be so well up in scientific nursing as female nurses, but there was a sense of comradeship between them and their patients, many of whom would prefer their ministrations to those of a trained female nurse.

*MR. BURDETT-COUTTS said he had no desire to discuss the respective merits of male and female nursing; all he said was that in war time if nurses were required they must be female nurses, because no large supply of male nurses would be available.

DR. FARQUHARSON said there should be a larger reserve of medical officers. He was not quite satisfied with the answer of the Under Secretary a few days previously, in which he said a large number of well-trained men had been employed in this campaign.

MR. WYNDHAM: Everyone who has volunteered has been sent to the front.

DR. FARQUHARSON said in that case his observations were not to the point. He concurred with the hon. Member for Westminster as to the necessity of an independent transport for the Army Medical Department; it was well known that during all these great campaigns the exigencies of the military purposes were given first place so far as transport was concerned, and he hoped that one result of the inquiry would be to lay down a principle of some arrangement of this kind. He wished to know whether anything was going to be done at the end of the war with regard to the Indian Bearer Fund. He could not admit, as the hon. Member for Westminster had stated, that the results of the campaign were disastrous. No doubt it was sad to see men suffering from enteric fever lying on the ground, but the results of the campaign were admirable when one considered that there was only 20 or 21 per cent. of deaths as against 17 per cent. in civil life.

*COLONEL BLUNDELL (Lancashire, Ince) said one thing which those in-

terested in this matter ought to know was what the Army was formed for. The Army was organised by Lord Cardwell to send 60,000 men abroad, yet in the case of this war we had sent more than three times that number, and had had to find supplies for more than four times the number. Had any Continental nation been subjected to the same difficulties they would not have been able to meet them in the way in which our Army had met many of the difficulties of this campaign. When the whole conduct of the war was inquired into it would be found that the War Office would come out far better than many others who had had to deal with the question. The organisation for sending out troops had worked so smoothly and well that it had rather escaped notice. Although he had spoken generally in favour of the War Office he was not one of those who was satisfied with army organisation as it is at home now. Every District Command should be organised as an army corps, or division, and embrace every force within it. The old theory was that in the field anything up to 100,000 men should be organised in divisions, and anything over that should be organised in army corps. Too much pressure had been put upon the chief of the staff by the organisation in the present war. He objected to engineers being turned into clerks of works. He ventured to urge that an engineer officer should be attached to every infantry and cavalry regiment for a short period of time for the purpose of teaching rapid entrenchment, which undoubtedly was one of the things which the war had shown to be necessary. Then there was another important point, and that was with reference to the Reserves. He would strongly urge that an option should be given to men of fair character to receive twopence per day extra, and to be called "furlough reserve men," who could be recalled to the colours by a simple order from the Horse Guards, or from the officers commanding their regiments, so that whenever a regiment was wanted for a small war it could take these men with it. That would enormously increase our strength. If the Army had to meet men armed with modern weapons it should consist of regiments the men in which were accustomed to act together, actuated by that *esprit de corps* which makes a man do more if he is working with men whom he knows. Another point with which everyone would agree was that arrangements should be made whereby the Reservists should have shooting practice every year. In conclusion, he strongly urged the Committee to recollect what had been done in the way of sending an enormous force which, on the whole, was very well equipped, to South Africa. Of course, the War Department had to buy horses all over the place, and had to extemporise a large portion of their medical Department; but when the matter was fully analysed it would be found that the War Office had done well, especially in connection with the Militia and Volunteers. He hoped the War Office would publish a statement as to what had been done throughout the whole of the campaign. Everybody must feel that what the Army had to contend with was not only the extraordinary improvement in small arms, but also in the power of moving guns of position with a field force. He felt sure that if any other nation were placed in the same position it would have suffered quite as much.

MR. WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield): At the outset I desire to say that I admire the manner in which the Under Secretary for War has always answered us in debate. I have a great admiration for his assiduity and hard work, and I regret that I am put in a position of having to make a protest against the War Office. I think, however much we may like an individual, and however good the work of individuals may have been, still the whole conduct of this campaign has been so bad that some protest should be made, and I therefore shall move a reduction of this Vote, as a protest against the recent grave mistakes of the War Office, and also to call attention to the need for military reform. The only speech during this debate in which the War Office was not condemned, was that just delivered by the hon. and gallant Gentleman. Before I go into what I consider the graver mistakes that have been committed, I wish to ask one or two questions. The first is about the huts. In this Vote £500,000 is taken for huts in the United Kingdom. How many men will they accommodate, and whereabouts are they to be situated? Then I should like to ask a question as to the Royal Reserves. I have seen a great deal of them, and I have seen their absolute inefficiency up to the present time.

They have been cavalry without horses, infantry without rifles, lancers without lances, artillery without guns, and altogether a practically useless body. They have also been deficient in officers. When I asked a question a little while ago I was informed that the average proportion of officers to men was 14 per 1,000 in the infantry. Anyone who has done any soldiering at all will know that when you have got to drill men who have for years been unaccustomed to drill, when you have got to lick a regiment into shape, 14 officers to 1,000 is a ridiculously small proportion. It is much less than the proportion in foreign armies, where the officers are worked much harder, and where there are very many more non-commissioned officers than we have in the Reserve regiments. The result is that the Reserve force is of very little use either for foreign service or for the defence of this country. Then there is another question. There is an item in this Vote for medicines and instruments. I saw a letter from a medical man who had been out at the front, who complained that the medicines provided were not sufficient or varied enough, and that the instruments were not good enough for field and stationary hospitals. I should like to have an assurance as to the quality, quantity, and variety of the medicines sent out for the troops, and I have no doubt it can be given. There is an item also for small arms. I would like to hear that efficient small arms are issued to all the troops in South Africa, or who are now in training at home, and that they are not compelled to shoot with rifles that are worn out, and cannot shoot straight. Thousands of men are supposed to be going through their course of musketry instruction with worn-out rifles that will not carry straight. Is there any hope of the new rifles being given to the men within a reasonable time of the ending of the war? I hope to see them issued or ready for delivery by Christmas. Then, with regard to guns. Three millions are put aside for the Chinese Expedition; but I do not see any sum for more guns. I believe that 572 guns were ordered at the beginning of the year, and were included in the Army Estimates; but if there is to be a Chinese Expedition, more than these 572 will be required. I should like to see more position guns and field guns. One of my complaints against the War Office is that they knew that guns of position were used in the field at last year's German manœuvres. We had representatives there who ought to have reported, if they did not report, upon them. I do not want to hark back on the ridiculous blunder of the War Office saying to the Australian colonies that they wanted infantry and not cavalry; but to this day we are suffering from a shortness of mounted troops and a shortness of horses. One initial mistake was made from which we have suffered enormously. When the Government knew that we should have something like 60,000 well armed and well equipped men to fight against, they only sent 10,000 from India and none from England. These 10,000 men were overwhelmed by superior numbers. Natal was invaded, our enemies were increased by rebels from our own colonies, and we had much greater difficulty than if the War Office had sent much greater forces at the beginning. They ought, at the very start, to have sent 10,000 troops from England in addition to those from India. The Commander-in-Chief said that an army corps was ready as soon as the transports, and we had more transports here than in India. We have been promised reforms in the War Office over and over again; yet two years ago it was found that there were serious deficiencies in the land transport. At the autumn manœuvres, the War Office thought they could do with amateur transport, and they got an energetic private firm to undertake it. But it broke down utterly. At that time, therefore, the War Office knew that they had not land transport for 30,000 men in England. What happened? Whereas the 10,000 men sent from India had transport and everything necessary, the moment troops were required to be sent from England there was a great deficiency of transport.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Mr. J. POWELL-WILLIAMS, Birmingham, S.): There was not.

MR. WARNER: I can prove it thoroughly. The first thing that Lord Roberts and Lord Kitchener found when they went out to South Africa was that the regimental transport was utterly deficient. The officers' transport was reduced, and by great strain sufficient transport was managed to be obtained to make an advance—but an advance only along a railway—not transport sufficient to enable

the army to march independent of the railway. Lord Methuen and other generals said over and over again that they had no transport sufficient to allow them to leave the railway. This want of transport has been the cause of the most serious reverses; the generals were compelled to make frontal attacks, which cost so many lives, instead of flank attacks, which they could have done had there been sufficient transport. Then, the sort of transport was wrong. So enamoured were the authorities at Woolwich of their wagons, that when Australia offered to supply transport for their own contingents they were told that the wagons must first come to Woolwich to be inspected. Of course, Australia did not send wagons to Woolwich. It was rather a long way round to South Africa. The last proof I will give of the failure of transport is that one of the greatest difficulties of the Royal Army Medical Corps was that their transport was reduced to one-fifth of what it ought to have been That was an absolute crime—something akin to shooting the wounded—or it is a proof that the transport was deficient. I do not myself think it was a crime. The Royal Army Medical Corps did the best they could, but the transport was inefficient. We had letters read to the House in which it was stated that the troops had been fed on one biscuit a day. The greater proportion of Lord Roberts's army were on half rations not for one week or a month, but for nearly three months. It is not a question of the hardships that have to be endured in war. These must always be faced and suffered, and occasions must arise when, owing to temporary shortcomings in the transport, they will have to go on short commons; but for the main army in the field to be kept permanently on half rations, not for a week or two but for three months, is a shame. [An HON. MEMBER: No.] Yes; the evidence is coming home gradually. Man by man, invalids and wounded soldiers are returning from the front telling the same story, and that story will be retold in the constituencies. One other difficulty the troops have been under which shows that the transport was not quite perfect, and that is that the money payments to the troops have not been forthcoming. I believe the greater part of the troops have not been paid for three months. I have seen a letter from a brother officer of mine who enlisted, in which he states that the men have not been paid; and I have seen many other letters which declared that there had been difficulties about the payment of the soldiers from March till June. I do not make these statements from hearsay; I have seen the letters, and that is proof that communications have been very badly kept up. There have been constant complaints of the failure of our artillery. What was my surprise to turn up the other day an old paper, printed in June, 1897, in which Lord Salisbury, in reply to a memorial from the Service Members in regard to the condition of both horse and field artillery, said—

> "May I beg you to convey an assurance that I will, in conjunction with my colleagues, consider carefully the points to which you have directed the attention of Her Majesty's Government."

These points may have been paid attention to in theory, but not in practice; and the result was that we went into the war with only two and a half guns per thousand soldiers, whereas every foreign Power provides five guns per thousand. Then, we went into the war without guns of position, whereas Germany had got guns of position mounted for use in the field. We must have inquiry not only in regard to the artillery, but into the surrenders of our troops, as to the reasons for our defeat after defeat, in which we lost guns and prisoners. We know that our men have not lost their pluck, that their shooting has not been at fault, that the generals have been very good; but there has been something deficient in the organisation. When we were told that there was to be an inquiry, of course we expected that it was to be before the dissolution; but the Government are putting it off until another Parliament is elected, and the sound of war has ceased, and the people are no longer anxious about sons who have been wounded, and have almost forgotten the relatives they have lost. We want something done sooner, out of which there may spring, not tinkering reforms, but reforms which will prevent breakdowns in the commissariat, in the hospitals, and in the line of battle. In the old phrase, somebody has got to be hanged. We will have to get a victim; but the day is seemingly to be put off before we find that victim. We say something must be done at once, some remedy found for

this crying evil; and some assurance must be had that this new war for which we are asked to vote three millions to-day is not going to be carried on with the same blundering as in South Africa.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a reduced sum, not exceeding £11,499,900, be granted for the said Service."—(*Mr. Courtenay Warner.*)

MR. BARTLEY (Islington, N.): I wish to ask one question, but unfortunately there is no one present to ask it of. It is a little awkward when you have a question——

Attention called to the fact that forty Members were not present (Dr. TANNER, Cork County, Mid). House counted, and forty Members being found present,

MR. BARTLEY (continuing): I wish to ask one question on the subject of this Vote. It has been announced that there will be a very full inquiry into all the circumstances connected with this war. I am sure that the country will demand a very full and searching inquiry into all the details, and I have no reason to suppose that the Government will in any way shirk this. There is much that has been done to their credit, and I am sure much will be done by the inquiry for the benefit of the country. But there is one thing which has puzzled the man in the street a good deal, and that is what I want to ask about. We do not want the despatches published yet, but we think they ought to be published as soon as it is possible to do so. What we know is that the judgment of the Commander-in-Chief has been given on certain officers. Certain officers have been sent back from the seat of war to England. We must presume that that has been done for some reason which the Commander-in-Chief thinks of sufficient importance. What I wish to ask is this: how does it come about that officers who have held high command in South Africa, who have been sent home to England because they have evidently not been competent to carry on their work, are given high command when they come back to England, and are considered just as if they had been successful in the campaign from which they have been sent by the commanding officer? I think that is a matter in which a great number of people are interested. People do not like exactly to be personal. I myself do not know a single one of those who have come back, but I say that it is demoralising to talk about an inquiry into the losses, and into the actions which led to the disasters, when some of the officers who have been responsible for those disasters come home by the order of the Commander-in-Chief and at once take commands of high position in this country. That does seem to me a very extraordinary position. It seems to me that the duty of an officer, and especially a commanding officer, must be to be efficient in the field, and if these officers are sent home because they are not considered competent in the field, it is vital to the prestige of the Army, as affecting the recruiting and the position of the Army at home, that officers who are not fit to take command at the seat of war, should not be given high commands when they come to England. I am not a soldier, and I do not profess to know anything about it, but I know perfectly well that in any other line of life such a result would not be possible. Whether it is owing to the system of the War Office or some other reason I cannot say; but I should like to have an answer from the Under Secretary of State, if he can give it, how this comes about, because I can assure him that it is talked about in many parts. It is absurd to talk about the reorganisation of the War Office and putting things in order if, when a man has shown himself not to be efficient and is sent home, he is given a position of responsibility in this country. I do not wish in any way to say that anything personal has been charged against these gentlemen; I have no doubt they are excellent men and brave in all respects; but, when they have been held to be unfit to remain in their commands on active service, it is demoralising to the service altogether that they should be given as high positions in England as if they had been successful in the field. I hope the hon. Gentleman will be able to give some explanation of this before the debate is over.

CAPTAIN SINCLAIR (Forfarshire): No one will contest the principles laid down by the hon. Gentleman who has just spoken. It is difficult for us in some of these cases to form a judgment at present, but I venture to support the request he has made that the Under Secretary of State should give us some information on the point this evening. There are one or two other questions which I should like to ask the Under

Secretary arising out of this. In the first place, can he tell us whether the £500,000 referred to in the Vote has been spent?

MR. WYNDHAM: There have been two sums of £500,000. There was the first £500,000, and the one now under consideration.

CAPTAIN SINCLAIR: Will the hon. Gentleman tell us about the sum for settlers, and what the probable annual cost of the garrison in South Africa will be? Are the settlers part of the garrison or not? What steps are being taken, if any, in the direction of this colonisation plan? For myself, without prejudging the matter, I cannot help confessing to considerable doubt as to whether any large enterprise of this kind is likely to be successful. I only hope that it may be found possible, because it will mean that that portion of the world would obtain a valuable ingredient to the population. For the guidance of the public it is very desirable in any enterprise of this kind that we should know whether or not the hopes of the authorities concerned are really based on anything solid and substantial in regard to the matter. It must be a matter of interest to know for how long a period it will be necessary to maintain the garrison in South Africa, and I would ask the hon. Gentleman to translate into figures what the annual burden will be. An hon. Gentleman who spoke a short time ago hazarded the statement that in his opinion we were not very near the end of the war. Everyone who has studied this Estimate must realise that it is based on the assumption that we are near the end of the war. On this question I do not mean in any way to pin the hon. Gentleman or the Government to any definite opinion they have not expressed; but surely it is reasonable, when we are considering an Estimate which provides for gratuities, a large sum for medals, and other what may be called terminal charges for the whole enterprise, to assume that in the view of the Government at any rate, as Parliament is going to rise, we ought to look forward to those charges. The total sum taken for these terminal charges is £7,500,000. The Chancellor of the Exchequer told us in the spring when bringing in the last war Estimate that he had estimated for the current expenses of the war until 30th September. If after that Estimate we have in the end of July an Estimate making provision for what are largely terminal charges, does not that imply to an ordinary man who looks at the matter that the Government at any rate do not think there is any obligation on them to look forward to any very long continuance of the current expenditure?

MR. WYNDHAM: The hon. Member is really going off the rails. He has alluded to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, but he ought to keep in mind that the Chancellor of the Exchequer's announcement referred only to the actual money required. In Committee of Supply we have taken provision for war at full pressure for two months, and war at half pressure for six months, and this is the Supplementary Estimate. The Chancellor of the Exchequer will have again to come to the House for Ways and Means, which is quite a different matter.

CAPTAIN SINCLAIR: I am very much obliged to the hon. Gentleman for his explanation. I am sure his explanation is perfectly clear to those who understand the intricacies, but to the ordinary man who is told by the Chancellor of the Exchequer that provision has been made for the war to the 30th September, I think the inference is that the Government do not look forward to a long continuance of the expenditure after that date. It must be remembered, no doubt, that the burden of the war since the Chancellor of the Exchequer made his statement has been greater than he or anyone expected The statement was made before the great outbreak of enteric, before the great loss of life by disease, and before the reinforcements necessary to replace this loss were sent. I must confess to considerable surprise at finding that we have now provision for the war being carried on at full pressure for two months and at half pressure for six months, and that we have "terminal charges" as well. I trust most sincerely that the estimate of the hon. Gentleman will not be exceeded, and I am sure that every Member in this House hopes that no further burden will be laid upon the Government or the country. I am not concerned myself to-night to criticise the War Office. For my part, I agree very largely with the hon. Member who said that the administration of the War Department had done a

great deal more than we had any right to call upon them or expect them to do. I will reserve my right to criticise afterwards when we have fuller information. I can say that certainly on this occasion, just as on every other occasion since the beginning of this lamentable war, when the Government have come to the House for supply, I shall vote for the prosecution of the war. One reason why I think it very difficult to criticise what has been going on in South Africa with any judgment at present is the entire lack of official information. The hon. Gentleman who spoke last said he did not want the despatches.

MR. BARTLEY: I said not at present —not until the war is over.

CAPTAIN SINCLAIR: I quite realise what the hon. Gentleman has said, but I regret that decision more than I can say. I think it is the greatest mistake from the point of view of the confidence of the country in the administration of the Government in carrying out this war. I do not want the despatches produced in order to give critics an opportunity for making attacks upon the Government in the very least. I daresay it will not be believed, but I say it honestly and frankly that I do think it is the greatest mistake in the world that the Government can make not to give us from time to time the despatches containing the intelligence in regard to what is going on in South Africa. The hon. Gentleman in a speech not long ago referred to certain proceedings which the Government had been obliged to undertake, or, at least, to encourage, in order to stimulate the patriotism of the country, and to produce a sufficient number of recruits. He described the proceedings which took place, and I agree with him that they would be considered insane in any other country. I cannot help thinking that some of the people of this country considered them insane, or, at any rate, open to criticism. If you want the people of the country to form a sound and wise judgment as to the war, keep them informed. It is one of the liberties and rights of the country that they should be informed, responsible as they are in supporting the Government. It is the greatest regret to me that the Government have been so reticent in this matter of the publication of the despatches. I am sure it will have one effect—however much future proceedings may re-establish it—and that is, it must undermine and impair the confidence of the country in the Government, and if anything is necessary in such a matter as this it is that the Government should be strengthened, not by the artificial means of withholding information, but by full and unsparing intelligence. Our complaint is not confined to the non-publication of the despatches. It refers also to the censorship. Censorship which is purely military and for military purposes no one has any title or right to object to. It is absolutely necessary to an army in the field, and we must submit to the discretion of the Commander-in-Chief, whoever he may be. When the censorship is no longer military but is also political—because that is what the censorship in South Africa has been —I believe it becomes a great danger. Again I say that we cannot speak with full intelligence. I can produce to the Committee a number of telegrams which have nothing whatever to do with military operations, but relate to matters of business—communications going from this country to South Africa, entirely apart from military operations, which could not influence tactical or strategical operations in the least degree—which have been subjected to the censorship. That is the portion of the censorship to which I object in South Africa.

MR. WYNDHAM asked the hon. Member whether he complained of suppression or delay.

CAPTAIN SINCLAIR: I complain of suppression. I have no doubt there has been delay. I complain not only of delay and suppression, but of editing and altering.

MR. WYNDHAM: That happens here occasionally.

CAPTAIN SINCLAIR: I can assure the hon. Gentleman that to my knowledge there has been absolute suppression —that is to say, there has been suppression of parts of telegrams. This may have been necessary, but it is a very strong step to take, and it shows what a serious business this has been. It shows the self-restraint which has been exercised in the country when attention has not been more freely directed to this. It is common knowledge that a meeting took place some months ago at which some

twenty Members of Parliament were present. I was not present, and therefore am not concerned personally. A message was sent out to South Africa reporting that the meeting had taken place. It was not merely curtailed and altered, it was suppressed.

MR. WYNDHAM: Can you give the date?

CAPTAIN SINCLAIR: I wish I had brought the papers here to give full information to the House. The meeting was held at the Westminster Palace Hotel and was attended by twenty Members of Parliament, who expressed their views on South African affairs, which I imagine they had a perfect right to do. A message reporting the result of the meeting was sent to South Africa. I have evidence which I shall be glad to submit to the hon. Gentleman. I have a letter from the telegraph office saying that the telegram was not delivered, and whether it was ultimately delivered I cannot say.

MR. WYNDHAM: I think the hon. Member will see that a charge of that kind should not be brought in this way. I do not think he ought to say that a message was sent to South Africa conveying the result of a meeting unless he gives the contents of the message.

CAPTAIN SINCLAIR: I shall be very glad to do so. I am not fully prepared, as I did not intend to speak on this subject, but the remarks of the hon. Gentleman who preceded me suggested it to me. I shall be very glad indeed to give the Committee the facts. Let me look at the other side of the question. Not only has there been a great restriction of news going from here to South Africa, but there has also been a serious restriction in South Africa itself. I call attention to these matters because I think they should be known in order to give people materials for forming a sound judgment on the matter. I am not in a position to do more than complain about these matters. Question after question has been put during the whole of this session on these matters—questions which were not hostile and which were not put in an inimical spirit—to which frank, straightforward answers would have immediately silenced criticism. I can now read to the Committee the telegram to which I referred a few minutes ago.

MR. WYNDHAM: The whole of the message?

CAPTAIN SINCLAIR: The whole of the message. It is dated February 14th, 1900. This was sent to "News, Cape Town," which I understand is a telegraphic address.

"To News,
"Cape Town. Feb. 14th, 1900.
"Influential conference Westminster to-day many Members Parliament delegates all parts support Bannerman, vigorous Liberal policy enthusiastically voted following Conference desires express appreciation strenuous efforts peace made by Cape and Natal Ministers, testifies deep sense difficulties forced upon colonists, especially severe strain inflicted upon Dutch by war with which Dutch entirely out of sympathy."

That is the message, and no one can say it is military; it certainly seems to me to have no tactical or strategical importance. This is the letter which came from the Eastern Telegraph Company, Limited, dated "London, 28th February, 1900."

"Dear Sir,—We have received advice from Cape Town to the effect that your telegram of 14th inst. addressed 'News, Cape Town,' has been stopped by the Government censor."

I will give the hon. Member another instance, and that is a telegram of condolence sent to Lady Symons by the late General Joubert. The telegram as it appeared in the press was as follows—

"Maritzburg, 26th Oct.
"The following telegram was received by the General Officer Commanding at Ladysmith to-day from General Joubert: 'In answer to your telegram of this date with reference to General Symons, I must express my sympathy and have to inform you that he was unfortunately badly wounded, died yesterday, and was buried. I trust the great God will speedily bring to a close this unfortunate state of affairs in which so many valuable lives have been and are being sacrificed, such as that of General Symons and others. I express my sympathy to Lady Symons on the loss of her husband.'"

The telegram, as sent, ran in this way in the latter portion—

"I trust the great God will speedily bring to a close this unfortunate state of affairs, *brought about by unscrupulous speculators and capitalists who went to the Transvaal to obtain wealth, and in order to further their interests misled others and brought about this shameful state of warfare over all South Africa,* in which so many valuable lives have been sacrificed, etc., etc.,"

to the end, as published. That was a telegram in which General Joubert expressed his opinion—an opinion in which no one here is called upon to

share. I do not, by reading this telegram, commit myself in the least to the opinion therein expressed, but I think it proves that the censorship has not been purely military, but has extended to matters political. I have other instances I could bring before the Committee, but I think these are sufficient for my purpose, my sole object being to prove the existence of what appears to me to be a very serious state of things. The Government may have thought themselves entitled to take these very grave steps; I only wish they had been frank with the House and said at a very early stage, "Well, we have done these things; we have felt obliged to do them; but we are perfectly willing to bear whatever responsibility may attach to our action." We find in South Africa, also, the prohibition of newspapers under martial law. At the present moment, two newspapers, and two newspapers alone which took a side opposed to the war—*Ons Land* and the *South African News*—have their circulation prohibited, not only in the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony, but also in large districts of Cape Colony. That seems to disclose a most serious state of things.

MR. WYNDHAM: It *is* a serious state of things; that is what makes the course of action necessary.

CAPTAIN SINCLAIR: The hon. Gentleman is too experienced and far-seeing a man not to know that the liberty of the press is one of the essential liberties of persons living under the British constitution. You may be doing a very dangerous thing in suppressing all expression of opinion, and you may be furthering your policy in but a very slight degree if you take such stringent and severe measures as these. But I brought these matters forward simply to justify my statement that we are not in a position properly to criticise the Government because of the severity of the censorship. While I am perfectly ready to vote the money the Government ask for to-night, so far as the main purpose is concerned, I wish to say that I reserve my criticism in other respects. We have had very little information about China. We are asked to vote £3,000,000 for China. I do not want to be one of those who urge the Government to be aggressive in China—I know a little of the difficulties of their position at the present time; but if the hon. Gentleman can give us any further information as to how this money is to be spent and whether the Government have any grounds for believing that the limits of our expedition are known or can be estimated in any degree, I am sure it will be a satisfaction to the Committee. The Under Secretary drew a picture, perfectly justifiably, of the activity of the present Administration in regard to Army affairs. But there is another side to all that. We must not forget what this Administration has brought in other repects. It has brought us an expenditure of £62,000,000 on this war; it has brought us in South Africa a state of affairs which is nothing less than a military despotism; it has brought us to the beginning of a foreign roster in connection with the Indian Army. The balance, therefore, is not all on one side. I do not lay these things solely at the door of the present Government, but I believe the spirit on which the Government have relied has been largely responsible for bringing us into these difficulties. This being the only opportunity we have of criticising the action of the Government, I have ventured to avail myself of it, and I hope the hon. Gentleman will give us some information in regard to the 15,000 men who are to be settled in South Africa, the 30,000 who are to be the garrison, and the expenditure with reference to the hutting.

MR. SEELY (Lincoln): I have no wish to follow the hon. Member into his general discussion of the relative merits of particular parties, of the censorship, or of the publication of despatches, but I must say that any abuse of the Government for withholding despatches comes with extremely bad grace from any gentle man sitting on the benches opposite. There has been but one fierce and determined attack by the Opposition upon Her Majesty's Government, both in this House and in the country, during the whole course of the war, and that was made because they published certain despatches. The less, therefore, that hon. Gentlemen opposite say about the withholding of despatches the more it will redound to their own credit. But I rose to ask the Under Secretary of State for War if he would answer a couple of questions. The first is whether he can give us any idea as to how many of the Militia regiments now embodied will continue to be embodied during the autumn. It may

be quite impossible for the hon. Gentleman to answer, but it would be a great convenience to both officers and men if he could give some idea. The other question is whether he can give the Committee any information as to the intentions of the War Office in regard to the Volunteers and Imperial Yeomanry invalided home. I have no doubt the War Office will treat them with every consideration, and I hope, as far as possible, they will be enabled to go to their homes and their friends. They enlisted for the war, and they have suffered very great hardships, to which, although they may have been unavoidable, no one expected they would have been subjected. They are therefore entitled to every consideration, and I cannot help thinking that questions of this kind are of more interest to the country than any general abuse of Her Majesty's Government.

*Mr. JOSEPH WALTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Barnsley): Until the speech of the hon. Member for Forfarshire there had been no reference in the course of this debate to the important question of the provision for military operations in China between now and February next. Important though the affairs relating to South Africa may be, I venture to say that we are face to face to-day with a still graver situation in the great Eastern Empire of China, with its 400 millions of people. As I understand the explanation given by the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary for War, there is provided in the Vote under discussion a sum of £3,000,000 for military operations which may be necessary in upholding British rights and interests in China between now and next February. I cannot help noticing the enormous difference between the preparations made in the case of South Africa and in the case of China. To assert British rights and interests in the South African Republics, with a population numbering less than that of the city of Manchester, it has been necessary to send out 200,000 men. In regard to China, where our commercial interests are of infinitely greater importance than in South Africa—we were told the other night that of the £70,000,000 of import and export trade of China to-day the share of the British Empire is no less than £43,000,000, with unlimited opportunities for expansion in the future—provision is being made for sending out only 11,000 troops and 4,000 coolies. I venture to express grave doubts as to whether that is an adequate provision for upholding our just rights and interests. I desire no aggression upon China. The policy I advocate is that of preserving China for the Chinese, with equal opportunities for all nations to trade with her. With regard to what will happen when hostilities are over, and the question of settlement arises—which I hope will be in the direction of setting up an enlightened and stable government of Chinese to govern the Chinese and the opening up of the country to the trade of all nations—I put this case to the Government: If we stand on one side now, and if Russia has 50,000 troops on the ground, Japan 50,000, and France and Germany between them perhaps another 50,000, and Great Britain with her £43,000,000 out of the £70,000,000 of trade only 11,000 troops, how much regard will these other nations pay to the opinion of Great Britain as to what the terms of that settlement should be? If we are to have a proper influence in deciding what that just and equitable settlement should be it is incumbent upon us that we should take a proper share in the task of restoring order in that great Empire. My object is not to slay the Chinese or to advance upon Peking, as the German Emperor would have us do, as a matter of revenge. My object rather is that we should be to China what the most enlightened and patriotic Chinamen have expected us to be—namely, the friend of China, the friend who would help China to resist unjust aggressions of nations like Russia and Germany on the integrity of the Chinese Empire. It is on these lines that I say it is the duty of this country to have an adequate naval and military force in China—in the great Yang-tsze region, where, I believe, we have in the Viceroys of Nankin, and Hunan, and Hupeh, enlightened and patriotic Chinamen, who are doing their level best to maintain order, and to protect foreigners in the enormous territories over which they rule. What is required is that a British force should be there, not only to assist them to maintain order, but to guarantee to them full protection in their persons, official position, and property, should there be at the close of hostilities any attempt made to subject them to punishment for their friendly, patriotic, and enlightened action. It is for these

reasons I believe the provision to be inadequate. I should have been much relieved if, instead of 11,000 we were going to send the full 22,000 men provided for in the Vote; I should have been encouraged to hear from the Under Secretary of State that Her Majesty's Government had included in this Vote the cost of transport for 10,000 British troops from South Africa to China; I should have been glad to hear that, as in the case of South Africa, Her Majesty's Government had made, if we cannot spare a sufficient number of native troops from India, an appeal to the Reserve forces—the Militia, Yeomanry, and Volunteers—of this country to offer themselves for service in upholding British interests in China. I am glad to see that New South Wales, without waiting to be asked, has undertaken to send a certain number of troops to assist in the military operations in China, and Her Majesty's Government might well have given our other patriotic colonies an opportunity to assist in upholding what are the commercial interests, not of England alone, but of the whole Empire. The fact is that we earnestly hope that these serious disturbances which have arisen in China will remain local and will die out as quickly as they arise. But who is there here who can confidently predict that this outbreak of the Chinese against the foreign intruders will not assume larger proportions? I greatly justify the action of the Chinese because they have been exasperated beyond the limits of endurance by aggressions upon their territory from Russia and Germany, and those aggressions, in all probability, would not have taken place if Her Majesty's Government had adopted a firmer policy. These complications are consequent upon the want of a firmer policy on our own part in regard to our responsibilities in China, and it is a duty that rests upon us now to give all the necessary backing and assistance to China which we can, so that at the end of the trouble, this nation, at any rate, will have borne a worthy part in upholding that just principle of non-aggression upon Chinese territory, and thus show to the world that our only desire is to preserve China for the Chinese, and equal rights for all the nations to trade there.

COLONEL WELBY (Taunton) said he intended merely to refer to some of the military questions which had cropped up in the course of the debate. One of those questions was the surrenders of British troops which had taken place in South Africa. Those surrenders were one of the most unaccountable things connected with this war, and it was a question which should be most thoroughly inquired into. He believed that in many cases these captures resulted from the want of fire discipline on the part of the men who had been isolated, who wasted their limited supply of ammunition. With magazine rifles their ammunition supply was very easily fired away. In many of these surrenders the British troops seem to have expended their ammunition somewhat recklessly, and instead of being able to hold their positions by steady firing and the careful preservation of their ammunition, a very great deal was wasted, and consequently the men were put at an immense disadvantage. But, whatever the causes might have been, it seemed to him that the commanding officers who surrendered with those troops, and who were responsible for taking up those positions, and for the disposition of those troops, and making the preparations for the advance, should most unquestionably be court-martialed; because in a court-martial they got evidence which was sworn, and they could go thoroughly to the root of the whole question. He did not mean to say that officers who had been temporarily in command should be tried, but whoever was responsible for taking up the position and the disposition of the troops in the place where they were surprised or captured should be tried by court-martial in the same way as a captain was tried for the loss of his ship. He believed that that rule in the Navy had been of the utmost importance in maintaining that firm determination to die rather than to surrender. With regard to the treatment of their men in South Africa, whatever failure there had been was the result of having to put something like 220,000 men in the field when they were only prepared to put perhaps 30,000 or 60,000 men in the field. Therefore, it was clearly attributable to their faulty system. If there had been unnecessary suffering for want of proper medical treatment it was clearly the fault of their system and not the fault of individuals. Personally he believed that their medical officers did the very best that was within their power. It had

been found necessary to attach young doctors to the service to meet the emergency. In any future reorganisation of the Army Medical Department he trusted that those responsible would take into consideration the advisability of giving to the Army medical officers more experience in the treatment of the various diseases and of wounds than they had in the past. He would suggest that in the future the Army Medical Staff should be able to go to the London hospitals or hospitals in other towns in order to increase their knowledge; where they would be face to face with the teachings of modern medical science and so increase their knowledge and improve their power of taking care of the officers and men in the Army. The hon. Member for Central Sheffield had referred to scouting. He wished to say that if scouting was to be properly done they would have to adopt an entirely new system. As one who had been a commanding officer he could say that not only was there no proper encouragement given under the present system for training in this most valuable part of cavalry manœuvres, but there was no proper time set apart for this important work. Scouting meant that they must use their horses and travel over a very large extent of country. He knew a case where a commanding officer was exceedingly keen about scouting, but when his regiment came to be inspected he was not praised for his scouting, but he was blamed because his horses were not in such a good condition. Practical scouting work meant incessant work for both horses and men, for they must be out all day, and they would have to put aside a great deal of show. Regiments were never praised for scouting work, and they never got any credit for it. If they were going to teach their cavalry how to scout well, and their infantry to shoot well, and to teach both how to use a spade and to be able to shelter themselves behind entrenchments they must entirely change the whole system, so that commanding officers would be encouraged to train in this respect. They would have to change the generals who were to judge these commanding officers. They required an entire change of system, and they must put aside something of the show of the Army and look more to the practical side and judge regiments more by their real work. Many clouds were rising on the horizon. The Secretary of State said that we have no field army at home. He unhesitatingly said that the money which had been spent in forming Reserve battalions had been simply wasted. The Under Secretary had spoken of the men who would soon return to this country from South Africa. We might find ourselves face to face with a war against a great continental nation. Therefore, it was necessary that those men should take their places immediately in a great framework. Those troops would return to this country simply as battalions, and there would really be no proper field force in this country. Nobody could doubt the ability of the Under Secretary for War, and the War Office could not have found a more able and brilliant advocate, for they all recognised his ability. They all recognised his power and his devotion to the work, but he would go so far as to say that he believed, in this critical time, when they had a great war on their hands in South Africa, and when there was a possibility of a rising in China, it would have been better for this country if no such able advocate as the Under Secretary had been found to defend the War Office. In that case the War Office, in all its nakedness, would have been before the country; but the hon. Gentleman had, by his skill and gift of language, thrown a screen over the War Office and over its misdoings which to him was a proof of his great ability and his great talent, but he ventured to say that those abilities might be to the detriment of his country.

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs): Several hon. Members who have spoken have made a demand that some guarantee should be given by the Under Secretary with regard to an inquiry into the mistakes that have been made in the course of the South African campaign. The demand for that inquiry has been made not from this side of the House alone but also from hon. Members on the opposite side, and this demand is shared by all parties in the State and by public opinion outside. There have been mistakes in the course of this campaign in South Africa which have been absolutely inexcusable. We have had surrenders, disasters, and mistakes which, to put it mildly, call for the closest inquiry. In my humble judgment the Government are not to be blamed for tactical mistakes, but they are to be blamed if they do not

realise that there is an opinion outside which demands a fuller inquiry than that which has yet been promised into these disasters. The Magersfontein disaster and others present themselves vividly to our minds. Some well-informed persons hold the opinion that those disasters could have been avoided, and they also consider that the enormous number of men who have surrendered is something extraordinary and demands an explanation. We are entitled to demand before this debate closes some assurance from the Government that those generals who have made these mistakes will have to pay the penalty of those errors which have resulted in the loss of so many valuable lives. My complaint is that, instead of making these inquiries, the men who have made these mistakes have been given important appointments simply because they have made those mistakes. Some of them have been given most important commands over here. Do the Government think that that is going to satisfy public opinion? Here you have men who have undoubtedly been the cause of these disasters in South Africa, who have been recalled, and they have been given most important commands over here. No doubt the War Office may be able to give a proper explanation of their attitude upon this matter, but public opinion outside is entitled to say that, until we know that the inquiry has been held and its result made known, and until we know what evidence has been given on behalf of these men, they certainly ought not to be entrusted with important commands in this country. We have not had a full and square promise from the Government of any such inquiry into these mistakes. It will not do to let this matter go on for a year or two. The public opinion of Scotland will not be satisfied about Magersfontein until we know who is responsible for that great mistake. And so with the other unfortunate disasters of the campaign. One fact which this debate brings home to our minds more clearly is the gigantic nature of the task which this House committed itself to when it passed £10,000,000 for the South African campaign. It has shown us that we must not attach too much importance to what Gentlemen say from the Front Bench as to what a war is going to cost. The Leader of the House has said that upon this subject the Government knew no more than the man in the street. They asked us for £10,000,000 for a start, and here we are nine or ten months afterwards, and we have got up to £61,000,000, which we are told is required to provide for the campaign up to the end of February next. I have one or two questions to ask about that. We ought upon such an occasion as this to have, with the sources of information at their disposal, something like a reliable opinion as to how long this war is going to last. I notice that the Under Secretary smiles at that question, but we are generally treated with a smile when we ask for information. If the Minister responsible comes down here and asks for another £11,000,000 after the war has been going on for eight months, is it too much to ask whether he considers this amount is going to be sufficient?

MR. WYNDHAM: The whole of this money is not for the carrying on of the war.

MR. DALZIEL: I have read the Parliamentary Paper, and I could not possibly have made that mistake, for I have heard the different interruptions made by the hon. Member in the course of this debate. I did not assume that all this money was for the carrying on of the war, but what I want to know is whether the hon. Gentleman intends coming down again for any additional sum for the South African campaign. Will he promise us that we shall have no more demands made upon us for this war?

MR. WYNDHAM: Upon the introduction of this Estimate, I stated that there were two factors which could not be determined, and they were China and South Africa. I stated that in regard to these two factors it was impossible to give an accurate forecast of our requirements beyond the end of February.

MR. DALZIEL: The hon. Member says that he does not know, so far as China is concerned, what is going to happen, and we are all painfully aware of that fact. We shall know more about it when this Parliament is a little older. The hon. Member will not, of course, be able to give us an absolutely authoritative opinion as to how long the war is going to last, but we have a right to expect, now that we have both capitals in our hands and over 200,000 men on the spot, an opinion as to whether or not we are to be asked for another Estimate. We

are asked to pass this money, and in the view of the Government it will provide for the campaign up to the end of February. But why to the end of February? I presume this House will meet again about the middle of January, and why should we provide to the end of February, when most people expect that the House will before that time be called upon to vote that money if it is found to be necessary? The Government have no right to make such a demand upon the House of Commons. They have a right to ask for sufficient money to provide for their requirements to the end of this session, and until the ordinary time which Parliament assembles. I should like the Under Secretary to give us a little more information on that point. With regard to the gratuities, I do not know whether they are intended to be a complete Estimate so far as this campaign is concerned. I trust also that the War Office will give their close attention to the question of the treatment of the sick and wounded on their return from South Africa. Anyone who goes about very much must have noticed the sickening spectacle of so many wounded soldiers and officers who are to be met with everywhere, and who bring painfully to mind the effects of this campaign. I think the Government will be supported by public opinion and by all parties in anything they may do to provide for the comfort of these men in the future. We know that at present there is a lot of sympathy for them, but not much money, and I desire that the Government should appoint a special Committee to inquire into the manner in which these wounded soldiers are to be provided for when this campaign is over. It will take a great deal of money to provide for these unfortunate men in a proper manner. We all know that, at the time a large number of these deaths took place in the war, almost invariably a certain amount of money was due to these soldiers. I wish to ask what steps the Government take in the case of privates to whom sums of money are due at the time of their death. I understand that the practice has been to advertise in certain newspapers, which are not always read by the people who should benefit by the amount that is due to these privates. I would suggest to the Under Secretary that he should give his consideration to this question, in order to make it easier for the relatives of deceased soldiers to know what amount of money can be claimed. With regard to remounts, I should like to ask whether proper precautions are taken, in connection with the purchase of horses, to see that they are satisfactory from the point of view of the country to which they are being sent and the nature of the campaign which they have to undergo. I know that in certain parts of Scotland certain gentlemen paid prices for horses which were altogether beyond the mark. A large number of the horses purchased on behalf of the War Office were sent to Liverpool, and a large number of them were never shipped at all, but were rejected upon arrival at Liverpool. I should also like to know whether the Under Secretary is prepared to meet the demand which has been made in reference to this disparity in the pay of the soldiers in South Africa. It is a curious thing that Tommy Atkins, who has gone from this country, only gets about 1s. 3d. per day, whereas if he happened to have enlisted in South Africa, he would have got something like 5s. or 5s. 6d. a day. I do not wish to underestimate the loyalty of our Colonial troops, but if a Colonial soldier is paid 5s. a day for doing the same work as Tommy Atkins, I think there is a case made out for an increase in the pay of Tommy Atkins. I should like the Under Secretary to tell us how it comes about that our Colonial troops are paid so much more than our own privates, and I should be interested to hear whether he can give some increased pay to these men who are so nobly fighting our battles. I have only one other question to ask, and it is whether the Under Secretary contemplates that there will be complete provision made for China so far as this Vote is concerned. I asked this question before, but I did not receive a satisfactory reply. It seems to me that the Government have totally failed to realise the importance of the situation. If the Government had been fully alive to the situation I do not believe that the present state of affairs would have occurred at all. I do not believe, if the Government had shown a little more foresight, that all this valuable time would have been lost, which has resulted, it must be feared, in the unfortunate massacres at Peking. I do hope that the Under Secretary will give us some sort of assurance that the Government are fully alive to their responsibilities in regard to China.

*MR. KIMBER (Wandsworth) said he wished to call attention to the treatment of the 13th Imperial Yeomanry, commonly called "The Duke of Cambridge's Own," who were captured at Lindley and taken prisoners by the Boers. No doubt they had to surrender through no fault of their own, but they did expect that when those men had been captured they should be treated with a little humanity by the enemy, for all Boer prisoners had been treated by this country with great consideration. When the 13th Imperial Yeomanry arrived at Kroonstad they received an order from General Colville at Lindley to proceed to join him at Lindley, which was forty miles distant, on the following day. They had already ridden fifteen miles, but they set off immediately and rode through the whole of the night and arrived at Lindley on the Sunday morning. The advance guard entered the town without seeing any of the enemy and expected to find there the general who had sent for them. But no such general was there, and they had not been given a word of warning. The Boers had obscured themselves inside the houses and they waited until the advance guard arrived in the market place when they deliberately fired them down. The colonel saw his advance guard in trouble and so he withdrew his force and secured a good position behind two kopjes. There his little band of between some 300 and 500 men, who had started out with only one day's rations, had to fight for four days and four nights against the Boers without the assistance of artillery, although the Boers used artillery against them. At last all their ammunition was spent and they had to surrender. During those four days Colonel Spragge sent off messengers to where he supposed Colonel Colville would be to tell him he was in trouble. His message was conveyed to Lord Methuen, who arrived at Lindley only to find that the rebel forces had left and had taken the Yeomanry as prisoners off to Reitz. They were then taken across the Vaal into the Transvaal and they crossed the line before General Buller arrived there. They must have been taken a distance of about 150 miles, and they had heard nothing about them since. It was some seven weeks ago that this surrender took place, and they had no information up to this very date as to whether these English prisoners were compelled to march the whole of that distance on foot, or how they got there at all. They knew that a great many of them were weak and sick, and had to be left behind. The prisoners who were left at Reitz were put over the Natal border, and arrived at Ladysmith in a starved and naked condition. They had been credibly informed that there was nothing like adequate medical service where the British prisoners had been confined, and that the food supplied them was inferior and insufficient. It seemed to him that they ought to be able to alleviate all this suffering in some way. In the same papers which told them of this want of information in regard to these prisoners they were informed that from day to day Boer prisoners were well treated, and that even the Boers were able to obtain medical assistance and medical comforts for their wounded from the British troops. He knew that the Under Secretary had sent a telegram to the Boers.

MR. WYNDHAM: What more can we do?

*MR. KIMBER said he was aware that if an English messenger was sent unarmed he might be refused admission, and might be shot as a spy, but had the Foreign Office made any real effort? Was the Foreign Minister willing to give him a letter if he would undertake to find someone who would try and get it through to the enemy? It was an extraordinary thing that seven weeks should have elapsed without being able to get any information as to the condition of those unfortunate prisoners, and he thought they were entitled to expect some better effort on the part of the War Office. If the War Department could not do it why not try another department? He trusted that some method would be found by which information could be obtained in regard to those unfortunate prisoners of war.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): I am most unwilling to add to the long list of questions which the Under Secretary has to answer. We have had three Army Estimates in which the expenditure relating to the war in South Africa has been dealt with, but I have not been able to gather from the statement made to-night what will be the total normal expenditure on the Army for this year apart from China and apart from South Africa, and I also want to know what is the normal expenditure which we may expect next year and the year

following. I daresay the hon. Member will be able to give us that figure without much trouble. We have lately been discussing the Navy Estimates, and we know that this year, taking into account the expenditure on naval works, the Navy expenditure amounts to £30,000,000. I should like the hon. Gentleman to tell us in the same way, including the expenditure on military works, what he estimates to be the total expenditure of the Army for this year. We want to know what we have got to look forward to. That is the only specific question which I wish to address to the hon. Gentleman, but there are one or two other points upon which I should like to say a few words. A good deal has been said about the necessity of an inquiry into the general conduct of the war. My right hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition spoke in a rather depreciatory manner of inquiries which were made under similar circumstances, but he showed very clearly that the Government began with what was equivalent to a promise that there should be a general inquiry into the whole conduct of the campaign. I will assume, for the purpose of my present argument, that this war was inevitable, and that the diplomacy of the Colonial Secretary had nothing whatever to do with it, and that it was forced upon us by actions for which we in this country were not responsible, but of which we had an intelligent anticipation. One of the subjects of such an inquiry would undoubtedly be the preparation made for this "inevitable" war by those who twelve months ago were in charge of the destinies of the Empire. I have endeavoured to procure some evidence bearing upon that point, and the hon. Gentleman has answered the inquiry I made by the Return which he gave the other day about the amount of warlike stores which had been borrowed by the Army from the Navy. That Return was estimated to the end of the year, and, therefore, I am not surprised that the amount is very small. I thought the Army had borrowed from the Navy to a much larger extent than this account shows. At the bottom of the Return there is a note which says—"No information has been received as to the amount of ammunition, stores, spare parts, &c., transferred in South Africa." Until we know how much the Army had to borrow from the Navy in South Africa, we are not in a position to say how much the Army was behind its proper state of preparation and how much it had to depend on the Navy at the beginning of the campaign. About six months ago we not only had to borrow naval guns for land service, but we had to borrow searchlights, and the hon. Gentleman could not give me any information as to why the Army had to borrow searchlights. Therefore, until that Return is made complete by including South African borrowings as well as others, we cannot say how much the preparations of the Navy contributed to make up for the want of preparation of the Army in the initial stages of this war. If there is to be a kind of general inquiry, this ought to be one of the subjects to be inquired into. Surely when the opinion of the country has got to be taken upon the policy of Her Majesty's Government in South Africa, one of the things upon which the country should be advised is not merely the state of your medical arrangements, upon which you have appointed a Royal Commission, but also the general preparation of the Government for this campaign and the general conduct of it. I do not see how this House can come to any conclusion on the subject unless that information is before us. Not only is a general inquiry desirable and necessary, but if I may venture to speak of the examples set by the little connection I have had with the sister service, I should say there is a case for demanding a special inquiry into these disasters.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): Koorn Spruit.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I will not mention Koorn Spruit.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I will.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: If one of Her Majesty's ships is lost or stranded, that is a crime on the part of the officer whose negligence has caused it, for which that officer can be put on his trial. It is a crime followed by severe punishment if any person deliberately or by negligence loses or hazards one of Her Majesty's ships. There is another provision which says that where no specific charge can be brought against any officer or man the charge is to be preferred against all of them, and all of them may be called upon to answer that charge. I do not know enough about military law to say whether there is any similar provision for the Army, but I cannot for my life distinguish

between the losing, hazarding, or stranding of a ship and the loss of a convoy or a regiment, or one of those disasters which have occurred so often in the course of this war. Let me take a specific instance. One of the earliest disasters in this war was the disaster at Nicholson's Nek. Sir George White, the commander in charge there, most gallantly and honourably took upon himself the whole responsibility for that failure. I well remember the vindictiveness with which the disappointed stockbrokers and halfpenny newspapers attacked Sir George White when all that was known of the facts was simply that the disaster had occurred and that Sir George White took the whole responsibility. Sir George White was afterwards locked up in Ladysmith, but that does not do away with the necessity for an inquiry. What has happened since? I will not dwell upon the jingo ovations which Sir George White received upon his arrival in this country from those people who formerly denounced him, which I think he accepted much too readily. Surely the man who was responsible for that disaster should not have gone about receiving these compliments for what he had done. Surely something is due to the Army and the country in a matter of this kind. Sir George White, having gone through these ovations, has now been appointed to a high command, and I do not believe there has been any inquiry into this loss at Nicholson's Nek, which is on all fours with the loss of Her Majesty's ship "Victoria," which was commanded by Sir George Tryon. I notice that there are some hon. and gallant Members present who have been connected with the Navy, and I would ask them what would have happened if Sir George Tryon had survived the terrible disaster in the Mediterranean? Supposing he had come forward and said, "Nobody is to blame but myself," would he not have been put on trial? Would there have been no inquiry? Not only would there have been an inquiry, but every officer on board would have been put upon trial. This is the discipline of the Navy, and I do not know why similar discipline should not prevail in the Army. If discipline in the Army is the same as discipline in the Navy, then I would ask why that which would undoubtedly have taken place in the Navy has not taken place in the Army. Has it taken place or is it going to take place? I do not know whether any hon. Member will say that there is any real difference between the responsibility of an officer at Nicholson's Nek and the responsibility of a naval officer on the "Victoria," which was lost six years ago. I will leave the point where it is, trusting that the hon. Gentleman in his reply will say something about it. The only other observation I want to make relates to the status of officers in Her Majesty's Army. I addressed some observations to the Committee on that subject six months ago, at the beginning of the session. At that time disasters like that of Nicholson's Nek were fresh in the memory of the people, and had made a vast impression on them. They had made the impression that however good the rank and file might be the officers did not appear to be adequate to the work. It was not my impression, but I could easily refer to the journalistic literature of the time to show that that was the general impression. I call the hon. Gentleman's attention to this, that vastly important as the duties of an officer of the Army are, we appear for many years past, although purchase has been abolished, to have limited ourselves to a smal class of the population for recruiting the officer staff of the Army, and we have done so by the most reprehensible and the most vulgar of all possible standards. We have established between the safety and honour of the country and the Army an ignoble and detestable standard —the money competency of the officer. We know that, in the main, our system up to this point has apparently been that no man shall serve the Queen as an officer unless he has, in addition to the meagre pay provided for him in the lower ranks, an income of his own sufficient to defray the customary expenses of his position. I say, from the information I have, and which I believe still to be true, that we pay salaries to the officers which are too small, and that in the face of these small salaries we permit and even encourage expenditure which is incompatible with life in the service. No man but a rich man can enter the Army—no man, I believe, who is not in a position to have something from his parents or relations in addition to his pay, and the hon. Gentleman himself was candid enough to acknowledge the truth of this indictment, so far as the cavalry is concerned. I venture to doubt whether the hon. Gentleman remembers it, because he has shaken

his head. I remember very well, with regard to the cavalry, he said it was a scandal that a man could not be an officer unless he had £500 a year. Has he done anything to amend that state of things? Has the Government, which through him acknowledged this scandal in the cavalry six months ago, done anything to remove that scandal? The hon. Gentleman is apparently inclined to deny my right to refer again to the matter. The cavalry is an important arm, and the weakness of the cavalry is one of the causes of the disasters we have suffered in this war, and in the face of history I am entitled to repeat what I said before. Now we know that that which was an admitted scandal six months ago in the cavalry is a scandal still, and unless we have some assurance on that point from him I must assume that it is the intention that it shall remain. The cavalry is not the only branch of the service in which this so-called scandal obtains. I consider it is a scandal in any branch of the Army if an officer from his earliest days is not able to live on his pay so as to meet all the expenses which are customary and proper. I should like to impress upon the House that this is not a matter of scandal merely, but it is a matter of safety. I have seen many letters in the newspapers on the subject, and one in particular struck me. It was from one who described himself as "A Country Gentleman." It was a great grievance to him that he could no longer afford to pay his family in the Army. It goes far beyond that. Not only has a country gentleman the right to send his son into the Army, but the country gentleman's gardener or any other servant has the right to do the same, and if a young man has the right to take that position he should be paid in a manner to enable him to live. If you do not do that you are barring talent out of the Army, as in so many other branches of the public service, on the vulgar ground that the person possessing it has not money enough to support the position. I want to press the hon. Gentleman for an answer on this matter, which I pronounce to be not only a scandal but a danger to the public safety.

MR. WYNDHAM: I think those who have listened to the last speech, and who remember what I ventured to say in introducing this Vote in the afternoon, will almost agree with me that I was well advised in making a self-denying ordinance when I said that I did not intend to repeat the things I said on the previous Estimates. What is the use of such repetition? This question of the pay of officers in the Army, and more particularly of the cavalry officers, I have dealt with on the Estimates at an earlier period. Moreover, I have gone further than the hon. Gentleman who has just addressed the Committee, for I have made a calculation by which I find that, quite apart from any expenditure on pleasure, the cavalry officer who lived the life of a convict, and never went out of his barracks, would have to spend about £150 a year out of his own money, in addition to his pay, in order to discharge his obligations. The hon. Member has, if the term is not an un-Parliamentary one, made an Old Bailey point. ("Hear, hear," and cries of "Order.") I thought I was entitled to use that expression. The hon. Member said "What have you done?"

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: What are you going to do?

MR. WYNDHAM: And therefore by that it appears he means that the Committee are to hold that a Supplementary Estimate is the proper instrument for bringing forward a legislative proposal which affects the Estimate of the year; he knows perfectly well, however, that there is no precedent to justify the bringing forward any proposal — such as, for example, the granting of a further allowance to officers in their quarters or any similar proposal which might diminish the charge falling on them, except upon the Estimates of the year; he knows perfectly well that until the Estimates of the year fall in no Minister would tell the Committee in one financial year what the department were likely to propose in the next financial year. The whole of the last six minutes of his speech were devoted to a point which I really do not think ought to be made in that Committee when they are assembled here to deal with another matter. I should like to thank my right hon. and gallant friend the Member for North-east Manchester for the generous and most just reply which he made to certain attacks which have this evening been directed against the Secretary of State for War. I think that the language he used was so good that his sentiments [laughter]—yes, it is not an easy thing to repel attacks of the kind that have been delivered. [MR. MACNEILL interjected a remark which

did not reach the gallery.] I hope that the hon. Gentleman opposite will not interrupt me. The words which fell from my right hon and gallant friend were, I think, echoed in the sentiments of all those who listened to him. Let us consider the nature of these attacks. It is said that the Secretary of State for War has been in office five years, and that he has not achieved everything which ought to have been achieved. But during the whole of the debate Member after Member has risen and said that my noble friend has done more than any of his predecessors upon the very question of the Army Medical Corps, which has been in the forefront of the discussion. One Member said, "You should return to the regimental system." Another said, "You should not have given titles to the Royal Army Medical Corps." Proposals have been made, but they have been diverse and even opposite. We have the assurance from the hon. Member for West Aberdeenshire that more has been done for the Royal Army Medical Corps by the present Secretary of State than any other. Then, again, I ask, what is the use of coming down with all this against the Secretary of State for War because the establishment of the Army Medical Corps is not adequate to the situation? He has proposed an establishment higher than ever previously existed and has not been able to obtain the number of officers he requires. It is said that the rewards that are offered are not sufficient, but, acting on the advice of his military advisers, he has gone further than any of his predecessors in the way of offering inducements to tempt young physicians to enter the Army Medical Corps. When it is a matter of common knowledge that the great medical schools have boycotted the Royal Army Medical Corps for years in order to exact, if I may put it so, military rank, and when their wishes have been met by the Secretary of State for War, is it fair to attack the Secretary of State because he has not sufficient officers to meet the situation? I will not dwell upon this, for the point has already been threshed out, and what is to be said on either side is well known to every member of the Committee. In view of the efforts made to increase the Army Medical Corps, in view of the fact that the establishment voted has not been reached, I myself am convinced that this is one of those questions of reorganisation which demand from us our most careful attention and most strenuous effort at the end of the war. But we cannot do this now. In my belief no increase of pay, no exaltation of rank can be expected in time of peace to attract a sufficient number of young, keen and ambitious men to fill up the places that must be filled up in time of war. You might offer a young man £500, £700, or £800 a year, but he is not going to bury himself under a cloud in time of peace at any military centre to attend a few hundred men suffering from the customary ailments of this country. He wishes to work in the country. He is perfectly ready to work for little or no remuneration in the slums of a great city or in the wards of a great hospital. He wants the practice and experience necessary for a successful career. Therefore, I have myself come to the conclusion that instead of striving to expand the establishment of the Army Medical Corps in time of peace to be adequate for the time of war, it will perhaps be necessary to have a very efficient and highly trained Army Medical Corps, and to make application to the great hospitals throughout the country to know in time of peace what men will be ready in time of war, or when you have a great concentration of troops in camp, to come forward and work for the Army as they would work in a great city in time of pestilence. I do not know whether this is the opportunity for submitting such conclusions, but some such idea as that must underlie the whole of our future policy in respect to the Army. If it is impossible in time of peace to secure men for your establishment it will also be difficult in time of war. You must secure doctors and chaplains in time of peace by means of a retaining honorarium, and claim their services in time of Imperial crisis. After what I have said, I think hon. Members generally must feel that the attacks upon the Secretary of State are most unjust. Since he has been responsible for the War Office, before the war or the rumour of war, my noble friend, with the Under Secretary, now at the Foreign Office, was able to persuade Parliament to increase the home establishment by 25,000 men; they secured the great measure for acquiring land on Salisbury Plain at a great cost; they have provided more money for rifle ranges than any of their predecessors; they undertook the question of coast armaments, and millions have been voted year

by year to give the country modern guns in place of the obsolete armaments we found when the present Government took office. I could go on, but I have travelled over that ground before, but I do feel that it is unjust and unfair to attack the present Secretary for War, who in his period of office has really done more than any of his predcessors in the way of bringing points before Parliament and getting them settled. There is really nothing to add upon this, but there is another point upon which I have a word or two to say. Rumours have from time to time reached me, and I am glad at last to know what really is the charge made against the exercise of the censorship in South Africa. There has been a great deal of mystification over it, and when I said in the debate the other day that letters of pressmen had not been censored, I was rudely interrupted. In order that the House should be in full possession of the facts the correspondence as to the exercise of the censorship has been published, and it contains a very clear letter from Sir Redvers Buller, in which he said that no man liked interfering with the correspondents less than he did, but that he found that without the censorship his plans were invariably disclosed, but that when it was applied a few days before an important operation his plans were not disclosed, and were therefore successful. Can it be said, when the total of our casualties amounts to 20,000 or 30,000 men, that such an exercise of the censorship is unreasonable? So far, the hon. Member for Forfar agrees with me, I believe.

CAPTAIN SINCLAIR: May I remind the hon. Gentleman that it was on my motion on behalf of an hon. friend that that correspondence was produced?

MR. WYNDHAM: Yes, after I had offered it three or four times. Although many questions of a vague character were addressed to me about the censorship no very great keenness was exhibited to come down to the facts; and I am not surprised, for what are the facts? This correspondence was published, and the hon. Member has to-night disclosed the whole of this atrocious business. He said there had been a political meeting at the Westminster Palace Hotel, attended by twenty Liberal Members, and that a message was sent to South Africa and had not been delivered there. I at once interrupted the hon. Member, and said that if these charges were made they must be made specifically; that the Government must be told what that message was; and the hon. Member was good enough to read the terms of that message.

CAPTAIN SINCLAIR: May I ask the hon. Gentleman, did he not know that the question I addressed to him to-night had been put on the Paper of the House addressed to him?

MR. WYNDHAM: I did not remember that, but I am very glad the hon. Member has given the terms of the message to-night. I cannot really carry them all in my head, but some of them were to the effect that twenty Liberal Members of Parliament in favour of a vigorous Liberal policy wished to express their sympathy for the Dutch in the strain to which they were subjected.

CAPTAIN SINCLAIR: If the hon. Gentleman quotes, perhaps he would be kind enough to quote correctly. The terms were "Dutch colonists," "subjects of the Queen in South Africa."

MR. WYNDHAM: That is the whole point of it. The hon. Member asks whether there would be any objection to such a message being published in this country. None at all. It is in terms to which we often listen in this House; but if the hon. Member were himself the censor in South Africa, and he found 10,000 of these very Dutch in a state of rebellion, and some 30,000 or 40,000 more trembling on the verge of rebellion and being persuaded to take the fatal step by precisely that kind of inducement, would he not have hesitated before publishing it? Of course he would. He would have said "This is not a telegram which ought to be published at Aliwal North." The hon. Member gave another illustration. He said that a telegram from General Joubert to Lady Symons had been presented in an altered form. He read the telegram in the form in which it was received. No word which redounded to the good judgment and good heart of General Joubert had been omitted. The words omitted were those which declared that the whole of the war was due to the unscrupulous operations of speculators on the Stock Exchange.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: And so it was.

MR. WYNDHAM: The hon. Member for South Donegal has made himself responsible on more than one occasion for that preposterous statement.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: And I stick to it.

MR. WYNDHAM: It does no harm in this country, but in Natal, where the loyalist farmer was having his farm burned down, where he was being told that the game was up and that the Dutch were going to sweep the British into the sea, that the British were an effete race and had no soldiers at their command and were the mere tools and playthings of these imaginary speculators, the effect would be very different, and I ask again, would the hon. Member, had he been censor, have permitted that message to be published?

CAPTAIN SINCLAIR: The hon. Gentleman asked whether I would have allowed the first telegram to be published in Aliwal North. That means, would I have allowed it to be published in a district under martial law. That does not meet my point at all. That telegram was stopped altogether, and was not published at all. I quoted it to prove that the censorship was not merely military, but was also political.

MR. WYNDHAM: I do not know why the hon. Gentleman interrupted me. It is a perfectly clear issue. He thinks the message to which he referred ought to have been delivered. On the other hand, I think it ought not. I do not think that hon. Members can persuade the House that messages of that character should be published, and I am glad to find that there is no more in the suspicions that have been entertained. Now to come to the broader question of an inquiry. The right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean appeared to agree with me that the time for an inquiry and the publication of the despatches had not arrived. But, as to the censorship, the right hon. Gentleman said that the press messages as to the battle at Nicholson's Nek and Lombard's Kop, in the earlier stage of the war, were censored. I have no doubt they were, and I imagine that the right hon. Gentleman would agree with me that, if Sir George White had permitted information as to the extent of the loss sustained by an army that was being invested, and which, as a matter of fact, was invested for four and a half months, to be given to the outside world, and the straits in which he was placed, he would not have been able to keep the enemy at bay. These questions are not so simple as they seem. They cannot be decided by laying down a broad proposition and by saying this ought to be published and this ought not. Some amount of discretion must be vested in our officers. It may be asked, did they exercise that discretion wisely?

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: I only used that fact regarding the censorship as showing that we knew none of the facts with regard to the battle, and that we did not know them now.

MR. WYNDHAM: I think what was said with regard to the letters from Ladysmith rather completes the case as to the censorship. Whether hon. Members thought that the military authorities were right or wrong, no doubt such communications as those referred to by the hon. Member for Forfar were suppressed as well as communications as to the state of the Army in Ladysmith. That was the story of the censorship, and on the facts as stated by the Opposition, I say the proper course has been followed. The right hon. Baronet asked, however, and quite rightly, "Are we never to know the real state of the case?" Of course we are.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Why not now?

MR. WYNDHAM: The hon. Member for South Donegal has Koorn Spruit on the brain. I do not mind taking Koorn Spruit as an illustration of my argument. The hon. Member for South Donegal believes that the Secretary of State and myself have been in possession during the last few months of a mass of detailed information on everything that took place at Koorn Spruit. Although the War Office promised a despatch on the subject two months ago, no despatch arrived until about a week ago. The reason given for not sending the despatch earlier was that although a Report had been received from General Broadwood, Lord Roberts did not feel justified in commenting upon it until he had made personal inquiries into all the facts among the officers engaged.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Might I ask, then, how it comes to pass that in connection with the engagement at Koorn Spruit no fewer than four Victoria Crosses were advertised a fortnight ago, with all the details set out, if we know nothing about the despatch?

MR. WYNDHAM: It is a matter of universal practice to confer the rewards for individual acts of gallantry on the

field on the immediate recommendation of officers. There can be no doubt about the gallantry of men who risk their lives to save the guns, when that act is witnessed by one hundred and fifty persons; but as to the action itself there may be the gravest doubt as to the apportionment of the blame, if blame has to be apportioned, between the general in chief command and the subordinate officers. The Commander-in-Chief was well advised after receiving General Broadwood s despatch in waiting for the opportunity to examine the officers commanding the regiments of cavalry and the battery of artillery. It does not follow that because Lord Roberts's despatch was received a week ago that this is the moment for publishing it to the House and to the world. I do not think it is. The despatches do not arrive in chronological order; and there is a great deal to be said against publishing the criticism of strategic and tactical operations in the field, while the officers concerned still retain the confidence of the Commander-in-Chief. Whether we are right or whether we are wrong, the Government do not propose to publish these despatches until the end of the war. ["Oh!"] At the end of the war there will be a full publication of all that bears upon these points which are of the greatest interest, and more particularly on the point that there have been very large surrenders on the part of our men. That is a question which must be most carefully and searchingly inquired into. No one feels that with greater conviction than the Government, the Commander-in-Chief, and the Adjutant-General; but that being so, how unfair would it not be to do anything which might prejudge the conclusions at which we should arrive? I do not think it will be found that our men have failed to show the stubbornness which characterised their forefathers; but whatever might be the result in the interests of the Army and the nation, the question should not be prejudged. The right hon. Baronet asked me pointedly whether there had not been a saving in connection with the Royal Reserve regiments which might be used as an appropriation in aid. There has not been any such saving, and the Reserves will cost all the money taken for them in the Estimates. I do not propose to reargue the question of the equipment of the Reserves. I have admitted that there have been hitches in supplying equipment and armament, but I have also said that these hitches have not been due to the fact that the equipment and armament were not obtainable, but to the fact that the applications had not been made at the proper time and to the proper quarter. It is a fact that in some of the military districts requests are not put forward with that promptitude and accuracy which are necessary, largely, because general officers commanding districts have been left so long without any responsibility and without the right to move a finger on their own behalf that the sense of responsibility and initiative is only coming to them somewhat slowly. In respect to one or two articles of equipment a portion of the delay has been due to the difficulty of getting supplies from the trade, but the greater part of it has been due to what I may call want of practice in the proper working of the powers conferred under the new system of decentralisation. I hope I have made that point clear to the Committee. The right hon. Baronet also asked a question as to what was being done in order to carry out the avowed intention of the Government with reference to making some provision for the widows of the men who have died in the war. That question is being worked out *de die in diem*, but it has not been possible to arrive at a solution or to frame a scheme in time for the present Estimate. The question will, however, be dealt with in the Estimate next year

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: The point I put was a specific point as to the shortness of horses at the present time in the Orange Colony.

MR. WYNDHAM: Now I recollect the right hon. Baronet's argument. It is not easy to carry all these arguments in one's mind. The right hon. Baronet's argument was an inference. He inferred from the disposition of the troops that had there been more remounts greater progress would have been made. I feel hardly justified in offering another set of hypotheses. All I know is that we have sent an enormous number of remounts to South Africa, and we have no reason to believe that we have not sent all the horses asked for. We have sent in all 111,000 remounts, including cavalry and mounted infantry horses. I see the Leader of the Opposition in his place.

He asked me some questions in reference to our policy of reserves of stores. I would be glad to enter into the matter at greater length more gallant friend the Member for, Great Yarmouth, and, indeed, I think it is a subject which well deserves the attention of the Committee. I will not argue again whether the War Office has been in fault in not putting this policy forward sooner, and I have shown it is not the outcome of this war, because it was commenced before the war. The policy is on all fours with the policy pursued in respect to the Navy—that is to say, a sum will be asked for in the Estimates next year as the first instalment of a total to be spread over three years, and when that sum is voted by a Committee of the House it will be held in respect to the Army as a sum is now held in respect to the Navy, and the Government and Parliament will be honourably pledged to the manufacturers of this country to continue the orders given to them on that basis. Having established that reserve by that means, the other part of the policy is that it should be automatically maintained at that level, and if that is done we will be in a better position than ever before if Imperial danger or emergency arises. If hon. Members who have not asked questions will bear with me, I will answer the hon. Members who have, although the answers may only be of interest to the particular hon. Members who put the questions. The hon. and gallant Gentleman for South-east Essex referred to what he called a policy of concealment, and also stated that the responsibility for the Koorn Spruit affair must be a matter of common knowledge to the troops in South Africa. I submit to the Committee that the fact that Lord Roberts himself, as Commander-in-Chief, was not able until the other day to come to a conclusion and felt it necessary to take a considerable amount of evidence on the matter shows that there has been no policy of concealment. Then my hon. and gallant friend entered into a somewhat pessimistic analysis of the number of troops whom we may expect to return from South Africa, and I think he took an unduly gloomy view of the situation. We have in South Africa now 150,000 Regulars. Of course a certain number of them are in the Reserve, but they will all return. Then as to the force at home. We have almost 118,000 Regulars, 72,000 Militia, 8,000 Yeomanry, and 250,000 enrolled Volunteers. A good deal has been said in the course of the debate that the force at home is not a field force. In a sense, that is quite true; but did anyone expect that there would be a field force in this country when more than two army corps, a cavalry division, and troops for the lines of communication had been sent out? These are sometimes called admissions on the part of the Government. They are not admissions; they are statements of fact within the common knowledge of every Member of the House and of every man in the country who takes the slightest interest in military affairs. The fact is, we are approaching the standard of establishment which will enable us to send two army corps out of the country towards the end of a great naval struggle with a first-class Power. If we have sent that number of troops out of the country, it follows they do not remain in the country, and that the troops which are in the country are largely the machine which created that army, and which created and maintains the army in Egypt, India, and the Colonies. That machine is capable, stiffened as it is by the Royal Reserve—which for that purpose has been most valuable—of being moulded into a field force. On the question of the Army Medical Corps I think I have said all that need be said. Then my hon. and gallant friend the Member for Lincoln addressed a few questions to me. He asked me if the Volunteers and the Imperial Yeomanry would be allowed to go to their homes when invalided home. Yes, Sir, certainly. I may say that invalided soldiers come back automatically to hospital, and when they reach the convalescent stage they have the choice of either going into a convalescent home or returning to their own homes. A sum on account is given to a man in this position—not as a rule the whole of the arrears due to him, because it has been proved by experience that it is better to give a man £7 under such circumstances than to give him £15 or £20. The hon. Member for Wandsworth put a question on a subject which fills many of us with great concern, and which must command the marked sympathy of all. We know how many there are at present whose nearest and dearest relatives are in the sad situation of being prisoners in the hands of the Boers and the hon.

Member, not at all unnaturally under the circumstances, asked whether the Government were doing all in their power in the matter. Yes, Sir, I think the Government is doing all that lies in its power in order to get correspondence and comforts and clothing to these prisoners. The question is not a very easy one. The hon. Member asked me why the War Office did not co-operate with the Foreign Office and the Colonial Office. That has been the procedure which has been followed since the very outbreak of the war for this very purpose. At the outbreak of the war President Kruger—acting, of course, well within his rights, since diplomatic relations necessarily ceased—declined to permit any emissary of the Government to have access, direct or indirect, to any British prisoner in the hands of the Boers, although he allowed Mr. Hay, the representative of the United States, to act as an intermediary—a concession which he was not bound to make. He also laid down that if any Government assistance were sent to the aid of the prisoners the Government of the South African Republic would no longer allow private assistance to reach them. Largely, however, through the efforts of Mr. Hay a better understanding was arrived at, and the conditions were somewhat modified. Consul General Croal, at Lorenzo Marques, was also able to be of great assistance as an intermediary, but, for reasons not within his knowledge, the President of the South African Republic would no longer permit Mr. Croal to act in that capacity, and stated that he wished all representations in respect to the prisoners to reach him through Lord Roberts. That being the wish of President Kruger we have asked Lord Roberts to spare no effort to secure the object which the hon. Member and all of us have so much at heart. With regard to China and the expeditionary force of 11,000 men which we are sending there, I have already explained that the money taken in this Estimate is sufficient for the prime and recurring charges of such a force, and an equal sum has been provided in case the situation in the Far East should demand considerable reinforcements. As to the question of policy, that is not one on which I am prepared to embark.

MR. WARNER: The discussion has travelled over such very wide grounds that I do not think it would be wise to press my motion for a reduction as a protest against the mismanagement of the War Office. I should, however, have liked to receive an answer to my accusation against the transport system in South Africa. It would have been more satisfactory if the Under Secretary for War could have contradicted my charge. I gather from letters I have seen that the majority of the forces under Lord Roberts have for the last three months been on half rations and without pay. That, I think, is evidence of a serious breakdown. Transport difficulties have also been responsible for a great reduction of hospital accommodation, and apparently, through some serious, some criminal mistake, the whole transport has been miserably inadequate. That is the charge I have made, and I am sorry it has not been contradicted. I should have been glad to press my motion for a reduction if it could have been taken as applying to the negligence of War Office officials and the Government, but, as the debate has ranged over much wider grounds, I do not feel justified in pressing it, and I therefore ask leave to withdraw.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Original Question again proposed.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS (Carnarvonshire, Eifion) wished to say a few words as to the treatment of prisoners by the Boers. He thought the information recently received would scarcely tend to reassure the relatives in this country of prisoners held by the Boers. The hon. Gentleman had told them that communications with respect to prisoners must pass through Lord Roberts, and, if the statement was true that Lord Roberts had turned thousands of Boer women and children out of Pretoria, and driven them into the field of battle, it was very much to be regretted. They had been unable to get any information from the Government on the point, but he ventured to assert that such a barbarous and inhuman practice was altogether outside the usages of civilised warfare, and he doubted very much if ever before such a thing had been done by a civilised people. No one could doubt Lord Roberts's courage, and no one had hitherto doubted his humanity, and he could only say that such conduct as this, if the charge were true, was the conduct of a panic-stricken

soldier. The country ought to be re-assured on this point, especially if we expected the Boers to extend decent treatment to the British troops they had captured. The Committee was now asked to vote a sum of eleven and a half millions. As to Members who had no expert knowledge of military affairs, it was impossible particularly as so much interest has been shown in it by my hon. and that they could pass any judgment on the details of the expenditure on Army organisation. But he, for one, did doubt very much whether we had got value for the money we had expended on our Army in past years. That expenditure for the past five years had ranged from seventeen to twenty millions annually, and the material result of the outlay was now concentrated in the Transvaal. Not only had we all our Army out there, but we had got in addition large numbers of Yeomanry and colonists. Let the Committee contrast the results of our own outlay with what we saw our opponents doing in the Transvaal, and then he thought it would be admitted that everybody concerned in Army administration in this country ought to hide their heads in shame. The Government were now asking for exactly double the sum which the Transvaal Government had spent on its army during the last five years. That expenditure was £80,000 in 1895, £495,000 in 1896, £386,000 in 1897, and in no year had it been over a million. But, taking the total at five millions, it sufficed to enable the burghers to collect sufficient war material to hold the entire British Army at bay for ten months—an Army on which we had spent a hundred millions in the same period. And in addition we had incurred a war expenditure of sixty millions. We had been told that the Transvaal Government was a corrupt oligarchy, which pocketed half the money voted for public purposes. Therefore, half the five millions must have gone into the pockets of President Kruger and his colleagues, and that made the contrast all the more striking. We ought to bring this war to a speedy conclusion, not so much on account of the Boers, but to spare England the humiliation she was suffering in the face of the whole world by reason of the lamentable position of affairs in South Africa. It was admitted that we had 220,000 troops out there, while the Boers had only about 20,000. We had drawn our supplies from every country in the world; and our fleets were bringing them across every ocean, whereas the Boers had only the armaments and food supplies they were enabled to collect before the war started, and had only had five millions to spend on them. Yet they were still holding us at bay; they had frequently out-generalled us, and had often defeated us. He thought that the best thing this country could do would be to endeavour to come to honourable terms of peace as soon as possible, and to engage some of the Boer generals, like de Wet, to re-organise our Army and endeavour to place it on a more satisfactory footing.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL said that, although the debate commenced at half-past four, that was the first opportunity Irish Members had had of voicing the views of their constituents, among whom were to be found the relatives of Irish soldiers whose lives had been so mercilessly, so cruelly, and so wickedly sacrificed in this atrocious guinea-pig war. He would be the last man in the world to complain of the attitude of the Under Secretary for War, who discharged his duties in so able and often-time in so sympathetic a way, but he did complain of the difficulty experienced in getting clear answers to questions, some of which he had repeatedly asked during the last six months. The hon. Gentleman has been congratulated on his powers of splendid evasion. He believed the compliment was richly deserved. Splendid evasion has been the manner of the hon. Gentleman in answering the questions he had addressed to him. Splendid evasion! If he were less courteous he might describe it by another word. In order to show the hon. Gentleman that he was not afraid to speak what he could only insinuate through the medium of questions he would tell him what he meant in the plainest manner. He believed the War Office to be a hot-bed of favouritism, corruption, and pollution. He, that afternoon, asked the hon. Gentleman whether the command of the Royal Irish Rifles, which had been rendered vacant by the death of the gallant soldier who led his regiment at Stormberg and was fatally wounded, would be given to one of his Irish colleagues or to an Englishman. The hon. Gentleman would not tell him what it was proposed to do in the back parlour in Pall Mall against Irish soldiers. Was he justified when he said that it was an atrocious

thing not to give the command to a compatriot of the officer who fell on the battle-field? This was the way that Irishmen in the field were treated. He wanted to put it plainly to the House. There was something to be said for passing over officers of the Royal Irish Rifles. They were Irishmen drawn from the small professional class. They were common fellows like himself, and they were passed over. He was justified in saying that the War Office system was one of corruption. The Irish Rifles were not the only persons who had something to complain of in connection with this unjust war. When the Inniskilling Fusiliers left Queenstown they were 1,145 strong, and he saw from the jingo prints that when the regiment turned up at Colenso, three weeks ago, there was only a remnant left. Two colonelcies became vacant, one by the death of Colonel Thackeray. Who received the rewards of valour in the field when these vacancies were filled? They were not Irishmen. The War Office was a sink of pollution. Now he came to another item. He was much obliged to the First Lord of the Treasury for not moving the closure. He was sure they would be pleased that he had something to say in favour of the right hon. Gentleman. The Under Secretary struggled in deep water about the Military Press censorship. The censor was a Whip of the Conservative Party, and so the office was well manipulated for political purposes. On the 6th March last Mr. Winston Churchill telegraphed from Natal that he had had an interview with Sir George White immediately after the relief of Ladysmith. That telegram was published in the *Morning Post* on 8th March. Sir George White said in that interview that he had been shamefully treated by the War Office; that he had been intrigued against by the War Office, and that he had been kept in his position by the most gallant Sir Redvers Buller. He asked the right hon. Gentleman about that telegram, and he assumed a mighty tone and would not answer. Sir George White had never denied that he used that observation, and Sir Redvers Buller had never stated that he did not protect Sir George White against the intrigue of the War Office. Was that the reason why Sir Redvers Buller was mentioned with censure in the Spion Kop despatches? These things were extremely interesting. He regarded Lord Lansdowne, the Secretary of State for War, as a gentleman who ought not to be entrusted with any public office. He would tell the Committee why. A gentleman who suggested to Sir Redvers Buller to re-write a despatch in order that the English public should get a garbled account of a transaction was unworthy of public confidence. As long as that gentleman occupied that position he did not consider that the life of any common soldier was in any degree in security. He believed that everything that was suppressed in the despatches was suppressed, not for strategic, but for political purposes. He supposed there was no man with a year's experience in the Army who did not believe in his heart and soul that Lord Methuen, the hero of Magersfontein, was a miracle of incompetency. The despatches that he first sent were never published. They were revised and edited in the War Office for public consumption. On 5th July the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury, replying to the hon. Baronet the Member for Cockermouth, said that many of the despatches in reference to the war would be published in a fortnight. Now they heard from the Under Secretary for War that the despatches were not to be published until the end of the war. That meant that they were not to be published before the General Election. The people were not to know how the campaign had been mismanaged. The Under Secretary had a kind of hankering after Koorn Spruit. Who was the officer guilty of the Koorn Spruit disaster? Their curiosity had been whetted by the Spion Kop despatches. The hon. Gentleman did not say it at the time, but it appeared that some great man had been involved in it. Who was the Koorn Spruit hero? Was not Lord Kitchener himself the Koorn Spruit hero? Why had Lord Kitchener's name been kept back? Why had not Colonel Long's despatch and his vindication of himself against the censure of Sir Redvers Buller not been published? It was scandalous that it had not been. On the first day of the engagement at Paardeberg there were 1,500 men disabled. It was the most disastrous day of the whole war. Lord Kitchener, and he alone, was in supreme command, and Lord Roberts' comments on Lord Kitchener had never been published. Lord Kitchener considered the lives of common soldiers just as an engine-driver

considered the coal put into the furnace to be consumed in order to proceed a certain number of miles. As they were aware, medical officers protested against the insufficiency of ambulances, and wounded men had to travel down to the base hospital in Cape carts without springs. He felt he must apologise for pressing the hon. Gentleman for information on one matter. The hon. Gentleman was the last person in the world with whom he would like to quarrel; for he behaved in a manner of singular nobility to a political opponent some years ago when he was the subject of an abominable charge, and went into the box to support the evidence as to character. But would he not now do for Colonel Long, who was a gallant soldier, what he did for a political opponent in the Law Courts? Why had not Colonel Long's despatch been published? Would not Lord Lansdowne allow it? Sir Redvers Buller, in his despatch with reference to Colenso, censured Colonel Long, but said also he was too ill to give his own account. Well, Colonel Long had recovered, yet his account had never been published. On the previous day he gave the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord from memory an account of the various surrenders and captures of British troops by the Boers, from Nicholson's Nek down to Roodeval. The right hon. Gentleman admitted that some of the men so captured had been released, and were now actually engaged in hostilities. He was asked if before the men went back to duty an inquiry was held into the causes of their surrender or capture. He got no satisfactory reply, and he ventured to tell the right hon. Gentleman that if no inquiry had been held then there had been a gross violation of the Queen's Regulations. Was Lord Lansdowne, because he happened to be an Irish landlord, and a bad one, to be allowed to ride rough-shod over the Army Regulations? There was another instance he would like to inquire into. Just before Magersfontein a certain colonel refused to obey a command of Lord Methuen—"dashing Methuen," as he was called. The ground of the refusal was that his horses were worn out and that the men had long been without food. That colonel Gough had never been court-martialled, lest it should compromise Methuen. What influence was there behind Methuen, whose policy had resulted in a sacrifice of 1,500 human lives, in addition to the maiming of 3,000 men? Why was he being kept in office? Again, General Sir William Butler was kept in office solely because he would then be unable, without a breach of military discipline, to disclose the nature of the despatches he sent home in September last, describing his fears as to the campaign, and prophesying the calamities that would come from it. The hon. Gentleman, no doubt, had shown delightful optimism throughout. In order to qualify for his office he was for some months a sub-lieutenant in a domestic regiment. He also went out to the Egyptian War and behaved very gallantly; but he must say he could not understand how anyone who had seen and realised what war was could talk so lightly, he had almost said so unfeelingly, of the miseries and trials of the men, and the tortures and agonies of their relatives at home. It was all owing to his hero worship of Cecil Rhodes. It was hateful to any man of sensibility that the lives and fortunes of our gallant fellows should be treated as mere pawns on the chess-board in the hands of incompetent and corrupt officials of the War Office, and that this should be done in the interests of society, and not of the people. He remembered the delight shown in Radical circles when abolition of purchase in the Army was brought about, but he failed to see that the good anticipated had resulted, and he grieved to know that the lives of his fellow-countrymen had been sacrificed by the disastrous incompetence of an abominable, corrupt, and belated War Office.

MR. T. M. HEALY said that when a Vote was brought forward to increase the sum granted for war expenditure to sixty-one millions, it was time that the Irish Members—the representatives of a people and of a poor country wholly opposed to the war—should, even at that late hour, raises their voices in protest. The attitude of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham in regard to the sacrifices involved in this war took his mind back to the days of Nero and Caligula. He could well imagine Nero in his palace, before ordering the wild beasts to be set free to spring upon the Christians, saying, in reply to some remonstrance which might have been addressed to him by one of his Ministers, "What does it matter about the suffering of the people?" This was a question whether Paganism or Christianity was right; and we now had the Paganism of the

twentieth century delivered by the Oracle at Birmingham. The Irish Members were asked that night to give their votes in favour of the continuance of a war founded upon most debased principles, and to vote for the war, although it had been proved that their countrymen had been among the bravest and the best. Let it not be supposed that in the protest they were offering they were insensible to the part which Irishmen had borne in the war. They regretted that the places of those who had fallen were not taken by comrades of their own blood, and that the promotion should be snatched by strangers. They also regretted that gallant soldiers—and this was a matter that must occupy a prominent place in the minds of Irishmen—who found themselves for a moment under a cloud had been hustled home and had not received the justice to which they were entitled under military law. Men who bore the scars of conflict, men in the position of Colonel Gough, had been driven into silence, while men who ordered the massacre of soldiers were allowed to remain in command. He did not blame the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary for War. He passed no comment on his conduct. He knew that no man could sympathise more than the hon. Gentleman with a gallant soldier, whether private or commander. Before he took the position to which he had been elevated he had known what it was to have a soldier's portion. Nor would he offer any criticism upon Lord Lansdowne. The noble Lord was an Irish landlord, and it might be supposed that in his criticism he might be influenced by the hostility that prevailed towards him. For his part he would never sever himself from any Irishman, whether Protestant or Catholic, Liberal or Tory. He was for Irishmen, and he said that no man who had the suggestion or shadow of disgrace placed upon his name should have been denied justice. They awaited justification. Fancy a man in the position of a commander of cavalry, having won his spurs on a hundred fields, being placed upon half-pay by the British Government, and denied the trial to which he would have been entitled if he had committed the lowest fraud known to a pawnshop. Where was the justification for this? He passed no criticism on Lord Methuen or Lord Roberts. He was not able to do so. He had not sufficient knowledge of military tactics, never having been with a squadron in the field, to say where the blame lay in these matters. He had read in *The Times* of the previous day a letter, signed "A," about the treatment of the Irish regiments at a place called Lindley. The writer said that his son was in that engagement. "A" was the initial of Lord Ashbourne, and that noble Lord had a son in an Irish Yeomany regiment. That Irish regiment, consisting of 800 gallant young men, on reaching Lindley found the place in the possession of the Boers. They held out for four days, being obliged to live on one spoonful of jam and two cups of coffee in the twenty-four hours, and in the end, when their ammunition gave out, they were obliged, after the loss of seventy five or eighty men killed, to submit to the last resort of brave men—surrender. This writer in *The Times* asked why it was that on board one of Her Majesty's ships the smallest matters were made the subject of court-martial, while in regard to matters of Army discipline high placed officials were simply ordered to return to their homes? He did not know. Whatever their political views might be, they were entitled to ask for executive justice, and, if necessary, for punitive justice in regard to all these matters. Let it not be supposed that, however much Irish Members were opposed to the war, their hearts did not thrill either with the defeat or victory of their fellow-countrymen. Much as he deplored the miseries of the war, much as he hated the very name of annexation, the conduct of the Irish regiments in the British service was as much a portion of the fame and glory of the Irish race as if they fought in the service of Ireland herself. Were all these matters to be passed over? He did not blame the Government when he came to the smaller matters of detail. Whether a wounded soldier had a blanket, or a waterproof sheet, or no sheet at all, was a matter that might be accounted for. If there was no doctor or stretcher-bearer at the moment, he was quite aware that there might be an explanation of their absence. But when they got an offender home in the cool of Pall Mall, a man under a cloud, why was his conduct not to be investigated? That was his presentation of the demand, and upon that matter he would say no more. He did not believe but that there might be exceptions, but,

taking Ministers in the mass, they had no desire to turn this war to the benefit of the election. He believed if they took English Ministers for generations they would find that there was a tradition which descended to them and prevented them from availing themselves of the mere strategems of war for Party purposes. He passed from that and he came to the charge which fell upon Ireland in consequence of this Vote. He protested against it, firstly, as a charge which they should never have been called upon to bear, and secondly, as a charge out of which Great Britain had all the profit and Ireland all the loss. He would not go minutely into this question, but he thought it would be a profound stigma on the Irish name if they did not, when opportunity arose, offer some word of protest on this subject. Ireland could have no gain, no advantage, or honour from this war. We had spent £62,000,000. Where had the money gone? To every nation in Europe, to almost every nation under heaven. They had all gained some little thing out of this war, except Ireland. We had gone to Bohemia, Chicago, Germany, Austria, France and Italy, and we had even gone to Spain, but from the nation from which our most gallant soldiers were drawn we had bought an occasional horse when we could not buy one elsewhere. Outside of that, not a sixpence had been spent in Ireland. What was the inference to be drawn from these facts? Khaki tunics and cartridges could not be ordered, for some paltry excuse, and although Ireland was linked to this country it was not to be allowed to supply any of the goods for the purchase of which it was so heavily taxed. The Moors were linked with Spain for 700 years, but were put out in the end, and in a similar way the union between Great Britain and Ireland would be terminated unless the former changed her policy in these matters. They had been told that night that it would be necessary to maintain a garrison in South Africa for some years of 40,000 men.

MR. WYNDHAM: 30,000.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Well, 30,000 men would, in future, have to be maintained in the Transvaal. Ireland would have to pay a proportion of the cost of that. They would have to pay for horses and provender, and for worsted stockings and khaki jackets for the use of men nurtured at the breasts of Irish mothers; but what were they to get out of it? If the war was a commercial investment what would be Ireland's share? The idea of a tax on the mines had been repudiated. The Government had now to take their orders from the mining classes. When the war broke out we were told there was something like a thousand millions of gold in the Transvaal. Two and a half per cent. on that would largely help to pay the cost of the war, but the Jews rose up and forbade that, so the people of this country were to be made to pay. Was Ireland to gain any advantage from this war? If not why should she be asked to pay any share of the cost? She had already paid dearly with blood. Ireland was involved in an unhappy partnership, and he wanted to see her put in the position of Jersey and Guernsey—allowed to grow her own crops and to have her own Parliament. Great Britain recruited her Army in Ireland and extracted out of the necessities of the people a heavy contribution of flesh and blood. Why not be content with that, and refrain from imposing this horrible war tax upon them? He begged to move to reduce the Vote by eight millions.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a reduced sum, not exceeding £3,500,000, be granted for the said Service."—(*Mr. T. M. Healy.*)

MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.) said he wished to join in resisting the Vote for war expenditure. Irish Members had been consistent throughout in their opposition to the war—they had continually protested against it; and bearing in mind that ten months had elapsed without any substantial success having been gained by our troops, he thought it would be admitted that the Irish Members were right and that the Government were wrong. The Irish had special claims to resist this unjust and iniquitous war. They were taxed out of all proportion to what was their fair share, and yet they were being asked to vote money for gratuities to the troops engaged in that miserable strife. What value were they to get in return? Irish money had helped to pay for the training of the officers, but what credit had they proved to this nation from a military point of view? Under the present system the great object of our military training was to see that the men's hair was properly cut, and that the cook-houses were kept clear. A couple

of years of that work was sufficient to turn any officer into a prig of the first water, and it was not to be wondered at, therefore, that there had been so many disgraceful surrenders of large bodies of our men to bodies of Boers inferior both in numbers and in arms. At one place, after ten men had been killed, 500 officers and men surrendered; at another, after three officers had been killed, another 500 officers and men surrendered, and at a third, after seven had been killed, eighteen officers and 400 men surrendered. And then when our troops did gain a victory they utilised their triumph for the purpose of wreaking merciless vengeance on the unfortunate inhabitants of the district, and he had seen heartrending descriptions of the manner in which our troops had treated the inhabitants of the two Boer Republics. He supposed that some of the money voted by Parliament would be paid as gratuities to officers—the men responsible for waging war on helpless women and children and the burning and looting of houses in the manner described by English correspondents whose letters had been quoted. We talked about Chinese horrors, and the savagery of the "Boxers," yet he thought the troops of this Christian nation were committing acts in the Transvaal which were equal to anything that had been done by those wretched fiends the Boxers in Peking. Half the money they were asked to vote that night was to suppress the Boxers. If there was such a thing as equal law and justice, instead of voting money to suppress the Chinese marauders they would be voting money to suppress the outrages in South Africa. He protested against any money being voted for the continuance of such infamous proceedings.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 12; Noes, 87. (Division List No. 246.)

AYES.

Crilly, Daniel	MacNeill, John Gordon Swift	Tanner, Charles Kearns
Doogan, P. C.	M'Hugh, Patrick A. (Leitrim)	Tully, Jasper
Healy, Maurice (Cork)	O'Dowd, John	TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Healy, Timothy M (N.Louth)	Power, Patrick Joseph	Mr. Patrick O'Brien and
Macaleese, Daniel	Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)	Mr. Donal Sullivan.

NOES.

Allhusen, Augustus Henry E.	Hamilton, Rt. Hon. Lord George	Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John	Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.	Plunkett, Rt. Hn Horace Curzon
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r	Haslett, Sir James Horner	Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds	Hayne, Rt. Hn. Charles Seale-	Purvis, Robert
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol	Hazell, Walter	Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Beckett, Ernest William	Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)	Rentoul, James Alexander
Bethell, Commander	Keswick, William	Ridley, Rt. Hn. Sir Matthew W.
Blundell, Colonel Henry	Kimber, Henry	Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Brodrick. Rt. Hon. St. John	Knowles, Lees	Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Bullard, Sir Harry	Lawrence, Sir E Durning-(Corn.	Round, James
Caldwell, James	Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)	Russell. T. W. (Tyrone)
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire	Lawson, John Grant (Yorks.)	Seely, Charles Hilton
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)	Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie	Smith, James P. (Lanarks.)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J (Birm.	Leighton, Stanley	Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Chamberlain, J. Austen (W'rc'r	Macartney, W. G. Ellison	Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Charrington, Spencer	Macdona, John Cumming	Talbot, Rt Hon J. G (Oxf'd Univ.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse	M'Arthur, Chas. (Liverpool)	Thornton, Percy M.
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)	Malcolm, Ian	Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Curzon, Viscount	Monckton, Edward Philip	Warde, Lt.-Col. C. E. (Kent)
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-	More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)	Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)	Morgan, Hn Fred. (Monm'thsh.	Welby, Lt.-Col. A C E (Taunton
Dyke, Rt. Hon Sir William Hart	Morrell, George Herbert	Williams, Jos. Powell- (Birm.
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r	Morrison, James A. (Wilts., S.)	Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Finch, George H.	Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute	Wodehouse, Rt Hon. E. R. (Bath
Fisher, William Hayes	Newdigate, Francis Alexander	Wylie, Alexander
Flower, Ernest	Nicol, Donald Ninian	Wyndham, George
Gedge, Sydney	O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens	Young, Commander (Berks, E.)
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredrk.	Pease, Joseph A. (Northumb.)	TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Goschen, George J. (Sussex)	Penn, John	Sir William Walrond and
Greville, Hon. Ronald	Percy, Earl	Mr. Anstruther.

Original Question put, and agreed to.

Resolution to be reported upon Monday next; Committee to sit again upon Monday next.

In pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th day of this instant July, Mr. Speaker adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at half after One of the clock, till Monday next.

[INDEX.

INDEX

TO THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

[AUTHORISED EDITION].

NINTH VOLUME OF SESSION 1900.

JULY 16—*JULY* 27.

EXPLANATION OF ARRANGEMENT AND ABBREVIATIONS.

Bills: Read First, Second, or Third Time = 1R., 2R., 3R. [*c.*] = Commons. [*l.*]=Lords. *Amendt.* = Amendment. *Os.* = Observations. *Qs.* = Questions. *As.* = Answers. *Com.* = Committee. *Con.* = Consideration. *Rep.* = Report. Where in the Index * is added with Reading of a Bill, or a Vote in Committee of Supply, it indicates that no Debate took place on that Stage of the Bill, or on that Vote. Subjects discussed in Committee of Supply are entered under their headings, and also under Members' Names, without reference to the actual Vote before the Committee.

Aberdeen, Earl of
South African War—Hospital and Medical Arrangements Inquiry, *July 19*, 448.

Aberdeen Corporation Tramways Bill
l. Reported with Amendts., *July 17*, 189.
3R.* *July 23*, 786.
c. Lords Amendts.* *July 27*, 1495.

Aberdeen Police and Improvement Bill
l. 3R.* *July 27*, 1450.
Reported with Amendts., *July 20*, 586.

Abraham, Mr. W. [Cork Co., N.E.]
National School Teachers, Ireland—Extra Subjects, Remuneration, *July 19*, 483.

Academy, Royal Irish
Celtic Manuscripts—Grant-in-aid for Salary of Irish Scribe and printing Manuscripts, etc.
Q. Mr. Dillon; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 19*, 479.

Addis, Gunner J.
Camden Fort—Gun Fatality
Qs. Mr. Flynn; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 20*, 647; *July 26*, 1304.

Aden Fortress
Indian Military Charges
Os. Lord Welby, *July 20*, 604; Lord Salisbury, 617.

Admiralty
First Lord—Rt. Hon. G. J. Goschen.
Secretary—Mr. W. E. Macartney.
Lord of the Admiralty—Mr. J. A. Chamberlain.
Residence of the First Sea Lord
Os. Admiral Field, Earl Dalkeith, *July 17*, 340; *Q.* Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *July 20*, 649; *Q.* Admiral Field; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *July 26*, 1310.
Staff, Increase in
O. Sir F. Flannery, *July 17*, 270.
Vote for, *July 17*, 338.
(*see also* Navy.)

Africa, Central
British Central Africa Protectorate—Chiromo and Lake Nyassa Railway, Construction of—Government Loan
Q. Sir B. Gurdon; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *July 20*, 651.

Africa, Central—*cont.*
British Central Africa Rifles, Misconduct of, at Mauritius—Laying Papers on the Table
Q. Sir B. Gurdon; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *July 20*, 651.

Africa, East
Ashanti, *see* that title.
Uganda Protectorate—Report of Special Commissioner Presented, *July 26*, 1268, 1298.

Africa, South
Blue-book—Publication of Letters addressed to *Times of Natal* and *Natal Mercury*, Substantiating Statements
Q. Capt. Donelan; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *July 20*, 645.
British South Africa Company—Transfer of Territory to the Crown, Negotiations
Q. Mr. S. Buxton; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *July 19*, 463.
Cape Colony, *see* that title.
Natal, *see* that title.
Settlement of Soldiers after the War, *see* South African War—Soldier Settlers.
War, *see* South African War.

Africa, West
Niger Coast Protectorate and Tonga, *see* those titles.

Afrikander Bond
see South African War.

Agrarian Outrages, Ireland
Return Presented, *July 20*, 588, 640.

Agricultural Districts
Educational Grants—Differential Treatment in Rural and Urban Schools Motion (Lord Heneage), *July 24*, 1024.
School Attendance Authorities—Byelaws
Q. Mr. Jeffreys; *A.* Sir J. Gorst, *July 23*, 868.

Agricultural Holdings Bill
c. 3R., *July 19*, 532.
l. 1R.* *July 20*, 589.
2R., *July 24*, 988.
Com., *July 27*, 1479.

Agricultural Holdings Bill
Debate on Third Reading (Commons), Second Reading (Lords), Committee (Lords), *July 19*, 532; *July 24*, 989; *July 27*, 1479.
Agreements between Landlord and Tenant, 540, 548, 564, 996, 1004.
Appeal from Sheriff-Substitute to Sheriff, 1490.
Arbitration, 535, 539, 549, 564, 991, 994, 1003.
Contracting-out, 539, 996.

Agricultural Holdings Bill—*cont.*
Debate on Third Reading, etc.—*cont.*
Distress, Law of—Limitation of Landlords' Right of Distraint, 538, 539.
"Inherent Capabilities of the Soil," 538, 989, 995, 1003, 1009, 1479, 1481, 1483, 1484, 1485.
Land Charges, Substituting Board of Agriculture for County Court, 992.
Landlords' Claims—Limit of Time, etc., 541, 562, 1005.
Landlords' Consent
Erecting and Altering Buildings. 993.
Fences, Making or Removing, 994.
Gardens, Orchards, and Osier Beds, 565, 993, 1007, 1491, 1493, 1494.
Reclaiming Waste Land, 1492.
Landlords' Right of Entry to view Holdings, 993.
Manures, 565, 990, 1487.
Notice of Claim, 1488.
Pasture
Permanent, 538, 539, 1005.
Temporary, 541, 565, 997.
Penal Rents, 1489, 1490.
Protection of Improving Tenant, 542, 555, 990.
Sale of Estate—Tenants' Position, 546, 555, 557.
Separate Legislation for Scotland, 535, 997.
Crofters and Small Farmers, 536.
Separate Legislation for Wales, 550, 557, 558, 567, 576.
Unreasonable Disturbance—Fixity of Tenure, etc., 541, 546, 554, 557, 571, 573, 576, 580.
Welsh Land Commission Recommendations, etc., 544, 551, 562, 571, 576.

Agriculture, Board of
President—Rt. Hon. W. H. Long.

Akers-Douglas, Mr.
see Douglas.

Aldershot
Entrenchments
O. Sir H. Vincent, *July 27*, 1574.
Recreations for Troops—Encouraging higher Type of Entertainment, etc.
Q. Capt. Norton; *A.* Mr. Wyndham *July 26*, 1306.
Taking over Command, Heavy initial Expense
O. Sir H. Vincent, *July 27*, 1577.

Alexandra Park Bill
l. 2R.* *July 19*, 410.
Report from Committee of Selection, *July 19*, 413.
Committed, *July 23*, 786.
Standing Orders, *July 16*, 1.

Allan, Mr. W. [Gateshead]
Water-tube Boilers and Naval Ships, *July 17*, 249.
Goschen's Mr., Statement, Committee of Inquiry, etc., *July 17*, 287.

Alverstone, Lord
Merchant Shipping (Liability of Shipowners and others) Bill, 3R., *July 26*, 1274.

Ambrose, Dr. R. [Mayo, W.]
Castlebar Post Office—Site for new Office, *July 20*, 667.
Tithe Rent-charge (Ireland) Bill, 3R., *July 16*, 132.

America
United States, *see* that title.

America, South
Buenos Ayres, Chile, etc., *see* those titles.

Ammunition
see Arms and Ammunition.

Animals
Cruelty to Wild Animals in Captivity Bill, *see* that title.

Appeal Court
Account of Receipts and Expenditure Presented, *July 19*, 414, 453.

Argentina
Agricultural and Commercial Condition of —Report Presented, *July 20*, 588.

"Argonaut," H.M.S.
Manœuvres of 1899—Speed, Repairs, etc. Adm. Domvile's Report and the Statement in the Memorandum
Qs. Mr. G. Bowles, Sir F. Flannery; *As.* Mr. Goschen, *July 17*, 227.

"Arguing with Sandwichmen"
O. Mr. Goschen, *July 17*, 245.

Arklow
Drift-Net Fishing Restrictions—Fishermen's Petition
Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Plunkett, *July 23*, 885.

Armaments for Armoured Cruisers
O. Capt. Phillpotts, *July 17*, 311.

Armour for Naval Ships
Limiting Naval Programme to output in Armour, etc.
Goschen's, Mr., Statement, *July 17*, 241.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, 273; Mr. G. Bowles, 278.

Arms and Ammunition
Artillery Ammunition Supplies
Q. Mr. Yerburgh; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 24*, 1045.
Exportation of to Foreign Countries—British Exports to China—Legislation
Q. Mr. Dillon; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 20*, 641; *Q.* Col. Pilkington; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 23*, 853; *Q.* Col. Pilkington; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *July 24*, 1041.
Prohibition of Exportation of Arms Bill, *see* that title.
Reserve of Army Stores, *see* Army.
Small Arms Ammunition Supplies
Q. Mr. Faber; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 24*, 1046.
(*see also* titles Cordite, Guns, Lyddite, etc.)

Armstrong, Whitworth and Co.
Manchester Works Wages Question—Army Contracts
Q. Mr. Woods; *A.* Mr. J. P. Williams, *July 26*, 1308.
Naval Shipbuilding Contracts, Offer to Construct Ships, etc.
Os. Sir F. Flannery, Mr. Goschen, *July 17*, 263, 264; Sir C. Dilke, 274.

Army
Secretary of State—Marquess of Lansdowne.
Under Secretary—Mr. G. Wyndham.
Financial Secretary—Mr. J. P. Williams.
"Administration"—Not a Question of "Reorganisation" or "Reconstruction" of the War Office
O. Earl of Wemyss, *July 17*, 203.
Aldershot, *see* that title.
Arms and Ammunition, *see* that title.
Artillery Ammunition Supplies
Q. Mr. Yerburgh; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 24*, 1045.
Artillery, Second Lieutenant's Promotion Grievance—Counting time spent at Woolwich as Army Service
Q. Mr. Bartley; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 17*, 225.
Australia—Proposals for the Defence of the Empire, *see* Australia—Defence.
Auxiliary Forces—Volunteers and Volunteers Bill, *see* those titles.
Band and Mess Expenses, *see* sub-heading Line Battalions.

Army—*cont.*
Barracks for Khartoum and Mauritius—Expenditure on, etc.
Wyndham's, Mr., Statement, *July 27*, 1533.
Bills relating to the Army, *see* their titles.
Boots, *see* South African War.
British Central Africa Rifles at Mauritius, *see* Mauritius.
Camden Fort Gun Fatality, *see* Camden Fort.
Cavalry, *see* sub-heading Officers.
Chaplains for Hong Kong, Appointment of
Q. Mr. B. Hoare; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 19*, 462.
Chaplains for South Africa, *see* South African War.
Chelsea Hospital Gardens—Closing at Eight instead of Nine o'clock, etc.
Q. Mr. Massey-Mainwaring; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 16*, 67.
Clothing and Accoutrements
Wyndham's, Mr., Statement, *July 27*, 1536.
Colonies
Equality between Imperial and Colonial Forces
O. Earl Carrington, *July 19*, 447.
Interchange of Troops
O. Marquess of Lansdowne, *July 19*, 447.
Raising part of Imperial Army in the Colonies
Os. Lord Brassey, *July 19*, 436; Marquess of Lansdowne, 445.
Reserve Forces of Australia
Debate (Lords), *July 19*, 435.
Scheme for Imperial Defence
O. Duke of Bedford, *July 17*, 198.
Commander-in-Chief—Military Statements in the House of Lords, suggestion
Os. Earl of Rosebery, *July 27*, 1470; Marquess of Lansdowne, 1477; Earl of Kimberley, 1477.
Commissions and Public Schools—Commissions alloted to Eton
Q. Major Rasch; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 24*, 1048.
Contagious Diseases—Petition for alteration of Law, *July 20*, 638.
Contracts
Armstrong's Manchester Works—Question of Wages
Q. Mr. Woods; *A.* Mr. J. P. Williams, *July 26*, 1308.
Irish Tenderers—Establishment of Depot at Dublin
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. J. P. Williams, *July 27*, 1508.
Sheffield Barracks Laundry Contract—Prosecution for Breach of Factory Acts—
Q Mr. Tennant; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *July 23*, 875.
Shirt Contracts—Total Number supplied for Troops in South Africa, Non-acceptance of Tenders from Irish Firms, etc.
Q. Mr. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. J. P. Williams, *July 23*, 861.

Army—*cont.*
Defence of the Empire, *see* that title.
Discharged Soldiers, Treatment of, Case of Private Weir, Removal from Netley Hospital to Enniskillen Workhouse — Cause of Insanity, etc.
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 16*, 65.
Enlistment and Recruiting
Recruiting Problem
O. Duke of Bedford, *July 17*, 198.
Statistics
Q. Mr. Shee; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 26*, 1306.
Under-age Recruits, Discharge of—Case of Private Walsh
Q. Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 19*, 458.
Expenditure
Appropriation Accounts Referred to Com., *July 27*, 1525.
Savings, Deficiencies, etc., Referred to Com., *July 27*, 1524.
(*see also* Army Estimates.)
Field Training—Training in South Africa, etc.
Os. Duke of Bedford, *July 17*, 199; Earl Spencer, 203.
Gibraltar Garrison—Officers' Houses
Q. Mr. Pierpoint; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 27*, 1506.
Gratuities for Soldiers Returning from South Africa
Volunteer Officers
Q. Mr. J. A. Pease; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 27*, 1505.
Wyndham's, Mr., Statement, *July 27*, 1530, 1553.
O. Sir J. Colomb, 1552.
Guns
Erosion of Guns by Cordite—Committee of Inquiry
Qs. Sir C. Dilke, Mr. Paulton; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 17*, 226.
Field Artillery
O. Sir H. Vincent, *July 27*, 1573.
Movable Guns of Position—Obsolete Guns in South Africa at the Commencement of the War, etc.
O. Earl of Wemyss, *July 17*, 204.
Reserve of Stores
Wyndham's, Mr., Statement, *July 27*, 1536.
Head-dress—Soldier's Death at Yarmouth
Q. Mr. Soames; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 26*, 1305.
Horses—Supply of Remounts, Lessons of the South African War, etc.
Os. Lord Tweedmouth, *July 17*, 204; Marquess of Lansdowne, 206; Sir C. Dilke, *July 27*, 1547; Mr. Wyndham, 1624.
Hospital Accommodation in South Africa, *see* South African War—Hospital and Medical Arrangements, etc.

Army—*cont.*

Huts—Supply, Expenditure on, etc.
Wyndham's, Mr., Statement, *July 27*, 1532.
O. Mr. Warner, *July 27*, 1584.

India Questions, *see* India.

Inquiry by Royal Commission
Os. Duke of Bedford, *July 17*, 199; Marquess of Lansdowne, 202.

Jersey Garrison—Annual Cost
Q. Mr. Lambert; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 26*, 1305.

Lance Exhibition—Sergeant Cartwright's Claim
Q. Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. J. P. Williams, *July 16*, 67.

Line Battalions, Formation of New Battalions—Band and Mess Expenses, Government Contribution, etc.
Q. Mr. Rentoul; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 17*, 225.

Marines, *see* that title.

Medals, *see* South African War.

Medical Department — Lessons of the South African War, etc.
Civil Institutions—Successful Civil Institutions in South Africa
O. Mr. Burdett-Coutts, *July 27*, 1571.
Insufficient Officers, Medical Schools Boycotting the Army Medical Corps, etc.
O. Mr. Wyndham, *July 27*, 1617.
Medical Training of Officers
O. Col. Welby, *July 27*, 1603.
Medicines and Instruments sent out to South Africa
O. Mr. Warner, *July 27*, 1585.
Nurses—Objections to Women Nurses in Field Hospitals
Os. Mr. Burdett-Coutts, *July 27*, 1571; Sir J. Fergusson, 1579.
Omissions from Mr. Wyndham's Statement
O. Sir C. Dilke, *July 27*, 1539.
Orderlies, Training, etc.
O. Mr. Burdett-Coutts, *July 27*, 1571.
Transport of the Royal Medical Corps
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *July 27*, 1540; Mr. Burdett-Coutts, 1569.

Medical Officers
Civil Surgeons—Supposed Pledge of Secrecy
Q. Dr. Farquharson; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 26*, 1301; *Q.* Dr. Tanner; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 27*, 1502.
Reserve Officers' Promotion Regulations
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 20*, 647.
Retired Officers Recalled to Active Service
Q. Dr. Tanner; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 27*, 1503.

Army—*cont.*

Military Lands Act, 1892—Purchases of Land by County and Borough Councils, Number of Acres purchased, Amount Expended, etc.
Q. Capt. Sinclair; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 23*, 859.

Militia, *see* that title.

Mounted Infantry—Australian Resources for Raising
Os. Lord Brassey, *July 19*, 436; Marquess of Lansdowne, 446.

Musketry Training—Lessons of the South African War
O. Sir H. Vincent, *July 27*, 1573.

Naval Stores Borrowed for South Africa—Return
Q. Mr. E. Robertson; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 24*, 1047; *O.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 27*, 1611.
Return Presented, *July 24*, 988, 1040.

Officers
Artillery, *see* that sub-heading.
British Officers in Indian Native Regiments, *see* India—Army.
Money Competency, "No Man but a Rich Man can enter the Army"—"Cavalry Scandal"
O. Mr. E. Robertson, *July 27*, 1614.
Supply of Officers, etc.
O. Mr. Warner, *July 27*, 1585.

Old Age Pensions for Soldiers
O. Sir J. Colomb, *July 27*, 1553.

Ordnance Factories—Revised Estimate of Charge Presented, *July 20*, 640.

Ordnance Stores—Reserve of Stores
Wyndham's, Mr., Statement, *July 27*, 1536.

Pay—Increase of Pay
O. Duke of Bedford, *July 17*, 198.

Picric Acid, Manufacture of in England—Sufficient Supply
Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 17*, 226; *O.* Sir C. Dilke, *July 17*, 336.

Promotion Board
Constitution of, by whom Appointed, etc.
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 27*, 1506.
Organisation, Functions, etc.
Q. General Laurie; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 26*, 1307.

Recreations for Troops — Encouraging higher type of Entertainment
Q. Capt. Norton; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 26*, 1306.

Recruiting, *see* sub-heading Enlistment and Recruiting.

Reforms—Reorganisation and Reconstruction of the War Office
Debate (Lords), *July 17*, 196.

Remounts, *see* sub-heading Horses.

Reserve Forces of Australia
Debate (Lords), *July 19*, 435.

Army—*cont.*
Reserve of Stores
Os. Marquess of Granby, Marquess of Lansdowne, *July 17*, 205.
Distribution of Producing Power, etc.
O. Sir J. Colomb, *July 27*, 1553.
Naval Policy
O. Mr. Wyndham, *July 27*, 1625.
Wyndham's, Mr., Statement, *July 27*, 1534.
Reservists
Pay and Allowances—Increase since Commencement of South African War
Q. Mr. Shee; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 26*, 1303.
Prison Warders, Number Withdrawn—Portland Staff, etc.
Q. Mr. J. A. Pease; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *July 23*, 878.
Rifle Clubs, *see* that title.
Rifles and Rifle Ranges, *see* those titles.
Royal Irish Rifles Command—Appointment
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 27*, 1503.
Royal Reserve Battalions
Bounty, Pay, and Allowances
Q. Mr. Shee; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 26*, 1303.
Statistics
Q. Mr. Shee; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 26*, 1306.
Supply of Clothing, Arms, etc.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *July 27*, 1539; Mr. Wyndham, 1623.
Scouting, Training in
Os. Col. Sir H. Vincent, *July 27*, 1574; Col. Welby, 1603.
Sentry Duty in the Metropolis—Number of Men detailed for Guards and Sentry-Go, etc.
Q. Major Rasch; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 19*, 462.
Small Arms Ammunition Supplies
Q. Mr. Faber; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 24*, 1046.
South African War, *see* that title.
Stores, *see* sub-headings Reserve of Stores and Naval Stores.
Strength and Organisation of Military Forces
Os. Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 27*, 1560; Mr. Wyndham, 1626.
Debate (Lords), *July 17*, 196; *July 27*, 1458.
Deficiencies—"Dangerous Military Deficiencies," Lessons of the South African War
O. Duke of Bedford, *July 17*, 197.
Military Attaché's, Warning, *see* title Defence of the Empire.
Military Needs of the Empire
O. Duke of Bedford, *July 17*, 197.
Tents, Supply of, etc.
Os. Lord Heneage, Marquess of Lansdowne, *July 17*, 205.
Training the Army for War
O. Sir C. Dilke, *July 27*, 1548.
Transport Service, *see* that title.
Volunteers, *see* that title.

Army—*cont.*
War Office, *see* that title.
Woolwich Arsenal—Accident in 1881, Case of James Quinlan
Q. Dr. Tanner; *A.* Mr. J. P. Williams, *July 26*, 1309.
Workmen's Compensation Act
Extension to the Army of the Principles of—Allowances to Widows, etc.
O. Sir C. Dilke, *July 27*, 1540.
Number of Men receiving Compensation, Amount of Compensation, etc.—Return Presented, *July 16*, 57.
Wyndham's, Mr., Statement on the Supplementary Estimates, *July 27*, 1526.
Charges for Military Occupation, 1531.
Charges indirectly caused by the War, 1531.
Clothing and Accoutrements, 1536.
Excess over the Estimates of the Year, 1530.
Permanent Charges, 1532.
Reserve of Stores, 1533.
Sums Voted on previous Estimates, 1528.
Terminal Charges, 1530.

Army Estimates
Appropriation Accounts referred to Com., *July 27*, 1525.
Savings, Deficiencies, etc., referred to Com., *July 27*, 1524.
Supplementary Estimate—South African War and China Expedition—£11,500,000, *Com.*, *July 27*, 1525.
Approximate Amount
Q. Captain Donelan; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 23*, 856.
Estimate Presented, *July 20*, 640.
(*for* Details *see* Army—Wyndham's, Mr., Statement, *also* titles of subjects discussed.)

Army and Navy Expenditure
see titles Army and Navy—Expenditure, *also* titles Army and Navy Estimates.

Arnold-Forster, Mr. H. O. [Belfast, W.]
Army Reserve Stores, etc., *July 27*, 1560.
Defence of the Empire—Committee of the Cabinet for Defence, Attack on—No Minutes kept of Proceedings, etc., *July 27*, 1568.
Jersey—Foreign Men-of-War, Manœuvring in and out of Harbours, *July 23*, 863.
Militia—Strength and Organisation, *July 27*, 1560.
Navy
Channel and Mediterranean Fleets—Time spent at Sea, *July 24*, 1049.
Marine Officers—Hot Weather Uniforms on Board Ship and Ashore, *July 23*, 863.
Submarine Boats, *July 17*, 321.
Water-tube Boilers—Appointment of Committee, etc., *July 17*, 317.

[*cont.*

Arnold-Forster, Mr. H. O.—*cont.*
Secretary of State for War and the Administration of the War Office, Attack on, *July 27*, 1560.
South African War—Inquiry into Surrender of British Troops, etc., *July 27*, 1558.
Volunteers Bill, 2R., *July 18*, 353, 359, 385.

Arran, Earl of
Tithe Rent-charge (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *July 19*, 431; *Rep.*, *July 26*, 1276, 1278.

Arsenic
Employment in the Extraction of Arsenic, Result of Inquiry
Q. Mr. Tennant; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *July 26*, 1318.

Artillery
see titles Army, Guns, Militia, etc.

Ashanti
Rising—Investment of Coomassie
Relief Column, Number of Persons Escaping from Coomassie with the Governor, etc.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *July 16*, 70.
Relief of Coomassie
Q. Mr. Drage; *A.* Mr. J. Chamlain, *July 17*, 230.

Ashbourne Act
Position of Land Purchasers under, etc.
Q. Capt. Donelan; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 24*, 1061.

Ashbourne, Lord — *Lord Chancellor of Ireland*
County Courts (Ireland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 16*, 39, 40.
Poor Removal Bill, 3R., *July 19*, 419.
Tithe Rent-charge (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *July 19*, 420, 426; *Com.*, *July 23*, 840; *Rep.*, *July 26*, 1275, 1277, 1282.

Asquith, Rt. Hon. H. H. [Fife, East]
Tithe Rent-charge (Ireland) Bill, 3R., *July 13*, 151.

Aston Manor Tramways Bill
c. 3R.* *July 17*, 215.
l. Commons Amendts.* *July 19*, 411.

Astronomer Royal
Report, *July 19*, 414, 453.

Atherley-Jones, Mr. L. [Durham, N.W.]
Companies Bill, *Com.*, *July 24*, 1069, 1070, 1071, 1109.

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. J.—*Attorney-General for Ireland* [Londonderry, N.]
Belfast Rates—Public Health Charge, Liability of Occupiers, *July 16*, 84.

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. J.—*cont.*
Cork Assizes—Selection of Jurymen, *July 23*, 884.
County Court Acts Administration—Traders' Grievances, Legislation proposed, *July 16*, 86.
Donegal Justices, Unsuccessful Application against, *July 23*, 884.
Poor Rate Deductions—Local Government (Ireland) Amendment Bill, *July 26*, 1340.
Sutton to Censure Railway, Method of Constructing, etc., *July 26*, 1339.
Tithe Rent-charge (Ireland) Bill, 3R., *July 16*, 130; *Re-com.*, *July 16*, 136, 140, 150.
Truck Act Prosecution at Dungloe Sessions, *July 23*, 883.

Attorney General
Sir R. B. Finlay.

Attorney General for Ireland
Rt. Hon. J. Atkinson.

Austin, Mr. M. [Limerick, W.]
Industrial Schools, Ireland—Case of the Abbeyfeale Children, *July 20*, 781.
Potato Cultivation -- Experiment with Electrical Conductors, *July 26*, 1340.

Australasia
Defence Proposals—Reserve Forces, Proposed Enrolment of Colonial Naval Reserve, etc.
Debate (Lords), *July 19*, 435.
Armed Forces of Australia, Number, etc.
O. Lord Brassey, *July 19*, 435.
Expenditure and Imperial Funds
O. Lord Brassey, *July 19*, 439.
French's, General, Proposal
Os. Viscount Frankfort, *July 19*, 439; Marquess of Lansdowne, 443, 445.
High Rate of Wages, Obstacle to Proposals
O. Marquess of Lansdowne, *July 19*, 446.
Imperial Yeomanry, Raising
Os. Lord Brassey, *July 19*, 437; Marquess of Lansdowne, 444.
Inspection of Colonial Forces by Imperial Officer
O. Lord Brassey, *July 19* 437.
Mounted Infantry — Australian Resources
Os. Lord Brassey, *July 19*, 436; Marquess of Lansdowne, 446; Earl Carrington, 447.

Australasia—*cont.*
Defence Proposals—*cont.*
Debate (Lords)—*cont.*
Raising and Maintaining in Australia small Imperial Force
Os. Lord Brassey, *July 19*, 437; Marquess of Lansdowne, 445.
Mails, *see* that title.

Australasian Commonwealth
Governor General
Appointment of Earl of Hopetoun
O. Vis. Sidmouth, *July 17*, 207.
Official Residence, etc.
Qs. Mr. Hogan; *As.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *July 16*, 69; *July 20*, 651.
Military Defence Proposals
Debate (Lords), *July 19*, 435.
Northern Territory, Annexation to South Australia in 1863—Right of Imperial Government, etc.
Q. Mr. Hogan; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *July 24*, 1050.

Austria-Hungary
Trade Report Presented, *July 20*, 588.

Avebury, Lord
Poor Removal Bill, 3R., *July 19*, 417, 419.

Avoch
Harbour Accommodation, Improvement of—Grant-in-aid proposed
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *July 16*, 78.

'Avondale Castle"
Transport to Cape Town—Non-observance of Queen's Regulations fixing Canteen Prices
Q. Mr. Bryce; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 19*, 457.

Bail
Regulations—Mr. Justice Wright's Statement in Charging the Grand Jury at Derbyshire Assizes
Q. Mr. Hazell; *A.* Sir R. Finlay, *July 23*, 875.

Bainbridge, Mr. E. [Lincoln, Gainsborough]
Companies Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1150, 1155, 1159.

Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *July 16*, 1.
3R.* *July 26*, 1266.

Balcarres, Lord [Lancashire, Chorley]
Business of the House—Private Members' Bills, etc., *July 16*, 105.
Lancashire Volunteer Regiments—Travelling Expenses, Supplementary Grant, etc., *July 23*, 860.

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J.—*First Lord of the Treasury* [Manchester, E.]
Arms and Ammunition, Exportation of to China by British Firms, *July 20*, 641.
Business of the House, *July 17*, 240; *July 19*, 485; *July 20*, 671; *July 23*, 888; *July 26*, 1343.
Winding up of the Session—Statement, *July 16* 87, 110.
Coal, Export of—Prohibition of Exportation of Arms Bill, *July 26*, 1313.
Companies Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1153, 1154.
Contempt of Court—Arbitrary Committals, Legislation, *July 23*, 887.
Education, Ireland, New Scheme—Opportunity for Discussion, *July 20*, 768
Equalisation of Dublin Rates, *July 23*, 886.
Germany — Anglo-German Commercial Treaty, Exclusion of Canada from Most-Favoured-Nation Treatment, *July 26*, 1343.
Indian Budget—Imperial Grant in aid of the Famine, etc., *July 23*, 1428.
Irish Railway Amalgamation Bills—Creating Tribunal to deal with Questions in dispute between Railway Companies and the Public, *July 26*, 1340.
Liberal Party and their Leadership—South African War Policy, *July 25*, 1243.
Local Taxation, Royal Commission Report, *July 23*, 887.
Parliamentary Procedure — Proposed Changes, *July 19*, 484.
Peace Conference—Ratification of Convention, *July 20*, 671.
Postal Delays—Suggested Inquiry, *July 24*, 1058.
South African War
Cost and Finance of the War—Supplementary Estimate, *July 23*, 856.
Despatches, Publication of, *July 16*, 62; *July 23*, 856.
Hospital and Medical Arrangements, Commission of Inquiry
Additional Members, *July 16*, 62; *July 17*, 222.
Cunningham, Professor, Appointment of, *July 16*, 61.
Enteric Fever, Inoculation against—Inquiry into Results proposed, *July 23*, 855.
Harrison, Mr., Appointment of—Member of Army Railway Council, *July 23*, 855.
Insanitary Conditions, Inquiry into, *July 27*, 1499.
Powers to enforce Attendance of Witnesses, etc., *July 24*, 1042.
Protection of Witnesses, etc., *July 24*, 1043.
Warrant for Royal Commission—Authority of Prime Minister, etc., *July 26*, 1300.
Koornspruit Disaster, *July 27*, 1500.

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J.—*cont.*
South African War—*cont.*
Rebels, Punishment of—Disfranchisement, etc., *July 25*, 1239.
Tugela Engagement—Publication of Col. Long's Explanation, *July 20*, 645.
Sunday Opening of Public Institutions—Sale of Catalogues, *July* 16, 86.
Tithe Rent-charge (Ireland) Bill, 3R., *July 16*, 130, 158.
Volunteers Bill, 2R., *July 18*, 359.

Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W.—*Chief Secretary for Ireland* [Leeds, Central]
Carrickmacross Workhouse—Proportion of Tramps, etc., Admitted, *July 26*, 1331.
Constabulary, Royal Irish
Batons and Handcuffs — Cost and where obtained, etc., *July 23*, 878.
Chamberlain's, Col. N., Appointment as Inspector General, *July 16*, 85; *July 17*, 238.
House Rent Allowances, *July 23*, 880.
Sands', J., Farm near Listowel, Protection of, etc., *July 19*, 479.
Sneem—Extra Police Force, Protection of Mr. Warden's House, etc., *July 19*, 481.
Tipperary and Limerick, Medical Appointment for, *July 19*, 474.
Cork Assizes—Case of Edmond Carmody, *July 16*, 86.
County Courts (Ireland) Bill—Circulating Draft of Rules, Orders, etc., *July 23*, 878.
Crime in County Monaghan—Revocation of the Proclamation, *July 23*, 877.
Derry Magistracy—Number of Protestants, Roman Catholics, etc., *July 27*, 1521.
District Councils, Disqualification of Tenant of Labourer's Cottage—Magistrates' Decision, etc., *July 26*, 1337.
Dromore River Floods, *July 26*, 1331.
Dublin Corporation Bill, *Con.*, *July 26*, 1294.
Education
Intermediate Education, Annual Report, *July 20*, 664.
Intermediate Education Board Clerks, *July 27*, 1524.
Monitors' Easter Examination—Delay in publishing Results, *July 20*, 664.
Glebe Loans Acts—Relaxation of Terms of Loans to Borrowers, *July 16*, 84.
Howth Harbour Boating Prosecutions, *July 24*, 1061.
Intermediate Education (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *July 19*, 487, 497, 525; *Com.*, *July 26*, 1439, 1440, 1442, 1443.

Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W.—*cont.*
Irish Education Bill, 2R., *July 19*, 526, 531.
Irish Language
Census Returns, *July 20*, 660.
Use of, in Irish Schools in place of English, *July 20*, 683, 707, 712, 726.
"Killing Home Rule by Kindness," *July 16*, 174.
Kilteevan Drum and Fife Band, Police Interference, *July 23*, 881.
Land Commission
Belfast—Increases of Rents, etc., *July 16*, 82.
Cork Fair Rent Appeals, *July 24*, 1062; *July 27*, 1522.
Dublin—Ulster Custom, Case of Lindsay v. Corry, *July 17*, 238.
Rossavalley Tenantry, *July 26*, 1336.
Land Purchase under Ashbourne Act, Acts of 1892, 1896—Terms of Purchase, etc., *July 24*, 1061.
Liquor Traffic and Liquor Licensing Laws—New Licenses, Licenses Extinguished, etc.—Return, *July 23*, 880; *July 26*, 1337.
Listowel to Tarbert Railway—Receiving Deputation with a view to giving Grant, *July 19*, 478.
Loan Fund Board—Report, *July 16*, 83.
Local Government Board—Return of Rules and Orders, Laying on the Table, *July 20*, 666.
Local Government Returns—Population, Electorate, Poor Law Valuation, etc., *July 23*, 878.
Lunatic Asylums
Grants-in-aid, Amount due to Local Taxation Account, etc., *July 27*, 1521.
Monaghan Asylum Works, Expenditure on—Loans, etc., *July 19*, 481; *July 20*, 660.
Malicious Injuries, Grants for—Including in Annual Reports on Judicial Statistics, *July 27*, 1522.
Mayo Assizes—Contempt of Court, Case of Mr. W. O'Brien, *July 20*, 667.
Meath County Council—Staffordshire Bye-law, *July 26*, 1338.
Monaghan
Crime, *see* that sub-heading.
Petty Sessions — Right of Appeal denied to M'Guigan and Hughes, etc., *July 16*, 81.
Muldowney and Finigan—Remission of Sentence, proposed, *July 20*, 665.
National Teachers
Arrears of Fee Grant, *July 27*, 1524.
Bonus—Credit for Amounts under New Salaries, *July 26*, 1341.
Extra Subjects—Remuneration, *July 19*, 483.
Grant for 1892-1895—Payment of Arrears, *July 20*, 662.

Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W.—*cont.*
National Teachers—*cont.*
Incomes, Payments according to Memorandum Issued by the National Education Board, etc., *July 26*, 1342.
Monitors, Instruction, Gratuities, etc., *July 19*, 483.
New Rules — Memorandum from Teachers' Association, etc., *July 19*, 482.
Poor Law Schools—Interests of Teachers in Contributory Unions, etc., *July 26*, 1342.
Result Fees, Payment of, etc., *July 23*, 879.
Salaries
Delay in Payment, *July 24*, 1064.
Future Scale
Allowing for Diminutions of Salary during past Three Years, *July 20*, 663.
Classification, Promotions, etc., *July 20*, 663.
Sneem—Teacher's Residence Site, *July 20*, 662.
Queenstown—Police Landing Regulations, *July 20*, 666.
Rate Adjustments—Rate Account due in past years, Exemption of Landlords, etc., *July 16*, 82.
Reformatory and Industrial Schools—Chief Secretary's Circular, etc., *July 20*, 771, 777.
Surveyors—County and Assistant County Surveyors devoting whole time to their Duties, Pensions, etc., *July 19*, 483.
Tithe Rent-charge (Ireland) Bill, *Re-com.*, *July 16*, 135, 136, 138, 139, 141, 146; 3R., *July 16*, 168, 174, 182.
Traction Engines on Public Roads, etc., *July 19*, 476.
Volunteers — Formation of Irish Regiments, Establishment of Rifle Clubs, etc., *July 20*, 665.
Workhouses
Belfast—Postponement of Appointment of Master, etc., *July 20*, 661.
Dietary Scales, *July 24*, 1060.

Balfour of Burleigh, Lord
Agricultural Holdings Bill, *Com.*, *July 27*, 1490.
Executors (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *July 20*, 618.
Lunacy Board (Scotland) (Salaries, etc.) Bill, 2R., *July 24*, 1010.
Town Councils (Scotland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 20*, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594.

Ballybunion
Railway to Listowel—Approximate Cost
Q. Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 16*, 80.

Banbury, Mr. F. G. [Camberwell, Peckham]
Colonial Stock Bill, 2R., *July 23*, 975.
Companies Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1123.

Bank of England
Income Tax—Deducting increased Rate of Income Tax from Interest Warrants maturing on or about July 1
Q. Mr. Maclean; *A.* Sir M. H. Beach, *July 17*, 231.

Bankruptcy
Ireland, Number of Cases closed by Official Assignees in 1899 — Return Ordered, *July 17*, 217.

Barnsley Corporation Bill
*c. Con.** *July 23*, 845.
3R.* *July 26*, 1295.
l. Commons Amendts.* *July 27*, 1456.

Barracks
Khartoum and Mauritius—Expenditure on, etc.
Wyndham's, Mr., Statement, *July 27*, 1533.

Bartley, Mr. G. C. T. [Islington, N.]
Artillery—Second Lieutenants' Promotion Grievance, *July 17*, 225.
Jamaica Railway Debentures and the Income Tax—Additional Income Tax deducted from Dividends matured before Jan. 24, *July 17*, 231.
Post Office Delays, *July 23*, 871.
South African War—Officers sent home taking Commands of high positions in England, etc., *July 27*, 1589.

Batons and Handcuffs
Royal Irish Constabulary—Cost, and Place of Manufacture
Q. Mr. T. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 23*, 878.

Bayley, Mr. T. [Derbyshire, Chesterfield]
Vaccine Lymph—Bacterial Impurity, etc., *July 26*, 1315.

Beach, Rt. Hon. Sir M. H.—*Chancellor of the Exchequer* [Bristol, W.]
China—Yang-tsze Cable, Financial Arrangements, etc., *July 17*, 220.
Coinage—Issue of Crowns and Double Florins, *July 19*, 469.
Colonial Stock Bill, 2R., *July 23*, 969, 973, 974.
Education, Scotland—Fee Grant, *July 17*, 237.
Income Tax
Bank of England deducting increased Rate of Income Tax from Interest Warrants maturing on or about July 1, *July 17*, 232.

Beach, Rt. Hon. Sir M. H.—*cont.*
Income Tax—*cont.*
Interest paid by Municipal Authorities and Interest paid by Public Companies and Private Persons, Rate of Income Tax chargeable, *July 19*, 470.
Jamaica Railway Debentures—Additional Income Tax deducted from Dividends matured before Jan. 24, *July 17*, 231.
Indian Famine—Imperial Grant, *July 26*, 1383.
Irish Lunatic Asylums Board—Supplementary Estimate, *July 27*, 1520.
Oil in Tobacco Bill, 2R., *July 18*, 402.
Public Works Loans Bill, *Com.*, *July 23*, 979.

Bedford, Duke of
Army—Reorganisation of the Army and Reconstruction of the War Office, *July 17*, 196.

Beer Retailers' and Spirit Grocers' Licences (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill
l. Reported without Amendments, *July 17*, 192.
Reported with Amendts., *July 23*, 837.
3R.* *July 24*, 1010.
c. Lords Amendts.* *July 27*, 1524.

Begg, Mr. F. [Glasgow, St. Rollox]
Companies Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1105, 1109, 1115, 1118, 1129, 1134.

Belfast
Land Commission—Increases of Rent, Mr. Commissioner O'Brien's Statement, etc.
Q. Mr. S. Young; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 16*, 82.
Postal Arrangements—Lisburn Road, Malone Road, etc.
Q. Sir J. Haslett; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 24*, 1063.
Queen's College—Report Presented, *July 24*, 988, 1040.
Rates—Public Health Charge, Liability of immediate Lessees
Q. Mr. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *July 16*, 84.
Workhouse Mastership—Postponement of Appointment, etc.
Q. Mr. Daly; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 20*, 661.

Belfast and County Down Railway Bill
l. 3R.* *July 16*, 3.
c. Lords Amendts.* *July 20*, 636.

Belgium
Coal, Metal, and Glass Industries, State of—Report Presented, *July 17*, 192.

"Belleisle" Experiments
Goschen's, Mr., Statement, *July 17*, 246.
O. Capt. Phillpotts, 312.

Belleville Boilers
see Navy—Boilers, Water-tube, etc.

Bere Alston and Calstock Light Railway
Order Presented, *July 20*, 588, 639.

Bethell, Commander G. R. [York, E.R., Holderness]
Naval Reserve Bill, 2R., *July 23*, 969.
Volunteers Bill, 2R., *July 18*, 383; *Com.*, *July 23*, 960.

Bhaunagar State
Famine Loan
Q. Sir W. Wedderburn; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *July 19*, 464.

Bhownaggree, Sir M. M. [Bethnal Green]
India
Budget—Famine, Remedial Measures, Imperial Grant, etc., *July 26*, 1398.
Education—Number of Technical and Art Schools and Classes, etc., *July 17*, 230.
Rainfall—Total in affected Districts, etc., *July 19*, 466.
Trade Statistics, *July 26*, 1315.

Bigwood, Mr. J. [Middlesex, Brentford]
Norwood Green Postal Deliveries, *July 26*, 1325.

Bilingual System of Instruction
Debate in Com. of Supply, *July 20*, 675.

Bills
Parliamentary Procedure, proposed change in—Debating Bills Reported without Amendments, etc.
Q. Mr. C. Williams; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 19*, 484.
Private Bills, *see* that title.
Winding up Business of the Session Statement (Mr. A. J. Balfour), *July 16*, 87—Debate, 95.

Billson, Mr. A. [Halifax]
Companies Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1106, 1156.
Jury Service—Exemptions, Remuneration for Common Jurymen, etc., *July 17*, 235.

Biological Association
see Marine Biological Association.

Blackpool, St. Anne's and Lytham Tramways Bill
l. Reported with Amendts., *July 20*, 586.
3R.* *July 24*, 986.

Blocking Notices
Alteration of Parliamentary Procedure, proposed
Q. Mr. C. Williams; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 19*, 484.

Blue-books
Publication of Newspaper Correspondence in—South African Blue-book
Q. Capt. Donelan; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *July 20*, 645.

Blundell, Col. [Lancashire, Ince]
Army—Strength and Organisation, etc., *July 27*, 1583.
South African War—Difficulties of the Campaign, etc., *July 27*, 1582.
Volunteers Bill, *Com.*, *July 23*, 958.

Board of Agriculture
see Agriculture.

Board of Education
see Education.

Board of Trade
see Trade.

Board Schools
London—Science and Art Instruction, Duplicate Registration, and the Board of Education Grants
Q. Mr. E. Cecil; *A.* Sir J. Gorst, *July 24*, 1057.

Boarding Out Pauper Children
see Pauper Children.

Boating in Howth Harbour
Prosecutions
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 24*, 1061.

Boilers
Mercantile Marine—Belleville Boilers in British Steamers
Q. Mr. D. MacIver; *A.* Mr. J. Collings, *July 17*, 229.
Naval Ships, *see* Navy—Boilers.

Boilers Registration and Inspection Bill
c. Report from Select Committee, *July 20*, 672.

Bombay
Land Revenue, Remissions
Q. Sir W. Wedderburn; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *July 19*, 465.
Rainfall—Serious outlook in the Gujerat Province
Lord G. Hamilton's Statement, *July 26*, 1351.

Bond, Mr. E. [Nottingham, E.]
Companies Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1080, 1089, 1136.

Boots
South African War, *see* that title.

Borough Funds Bill
c. Bill Withdrawn, *July 20*, 672.

Botanical Gardens
Dublin—Expenditure since 1890
Q. Mr. T. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 19*, 477.

Botha, Mr.
Martial Law in Cape Colony—Miscarriage of Justice, alleged
Q. Sir W. Lawson; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *July 16*, 63.

Bournemouth Corporation Bill
c. 2R.* *July 23*, 845.
Reported with Amendts., *July 27*, 1496.
Standing Orders, *July 17*, 215; *July 25*, 1161.

Bousfield, Mr. W. R. [Hackney, N.]
Companies Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1095, 1124, 1131, 1133, 1143, 1158.

Bow
Re-housing Scheme of the London County Council
Q. Mr. Pickersgill; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *July 16*, 73.

Bowles, Mr. T. G. [Lynn Regis]
Business of the House
New Estimates, Abandonment of Bills, etc., *July 16*, 102.
Supply, *July 16*, 91.
China—Anti-Foreign Rising
Papers Relating to, etc., *July 26*, 1298.
Yang-tsze Valley—Protection of Europeans, etc., *July 20*, 642.
Companies Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1066.
District Messenger Company—Royalty paid to the Post Office, etc., *July 26*, 1327, 1329.
Intermediate Education (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *July 19*, 495.
Navy
Shipbuilding Programme, Limiting to Output in Armour, Machinery, etc., *July 17*, 278.
Shipbuilding Tenders—Beating Contractors down, etc., *July 17*, 278.
Training Squadron
Officers in Charge of Dismantled Sailing Ships, etc., *July 23*, 862.
Re-commissioning the Masted Training Squadron, etc., *July 26*, 1312.
Water-tube Boilers on Naval Ships, *July 17*, 279.
Behaviour of Belleville Boiler Ships during Manœuvres of of 1899—Adm. Domvile's Report, etc., *July 17*, 227.

Bowles, Mr. T. G.—*cont.*
Navy—*cont.*
Water-tube Boilers—*cont.*
Expenditure on Belleville Boilers since 1895, *July 19*, 463.
Piccadilly, Widening, *July 24*, 1059.
Senior Naval Lord—Official Residence in the Vicinity of the Admiralty, *July 20*, 649.
Tithe Rent-charge (Ireland) Bill, 3R., *July 16*, 124.
"Victoria and Albert" Yacht, *July 27*, 1509.

Bradford Corporation Bill
l. 3R.* *July 26*, 1266.

Brakes
Continuous Brakes on Railways—Report Presented, *July 23*, 759, 848.

Brassey, Lord
Australian Reserve Forces, proposed Enrolment of Colonial Naval Reserve, etc., *July 19*, 435.

Bray Urban District Council Bill
l. 3R.* *July 17*, 189.

Bray and Enniskerry Railway Bill
l. Report from Committee of Selection, *July 19*, 413; *July 23*, 788.
Report from Select Committee and Bill Committed, *July 26*, 1265.
Reported with Amendts., *July 27*, 1449.

Braye, Lord
Militia Reorganisation—Regulations with reference to Volunteering for Foreign Service, etc., *July 26*, 1285.

Brazil
Trade Report Presented, *July 17*, 192.

Brehon Laws
Publication of
Q. Mr. T. J. Sullivan; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 26*, 1337.

British Central Africa
see Africa, Central.

British Honduras
Cable Communication—Want of Direct Communication, Dependence on Foreign Cables, etc.
Q. Mr. Tomlinson; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *July 19*, 464.

British Museum
Historical Manuscripts, Publication of
Q. Sir H. Fowler; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 17*, 234.
Pinches, Mr. T. G. — Superannuation, Treasury Minute, *July 16*, 8, 56.

British South Africa Company
Transfer of Territory to the Crown—Negotiations
Q. Mr. S. Buxton; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *July 19*, 463.

Broadhurst, Mr. H. [Leicester]
Volunteers Bill, 2R., *July 18*, 384.

Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John — *Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs* [Surrey, Guildford]
British Central African Protectorate—Chiromo and Lake Nyassa Railway, Construction of, etc., *July 20*, 651.
China
Anti-Foreign Rising
Advance of Allies on Peking, *July 27*, 1498.
Allied Forces
Officer in Command, *July 16*, 61.
Strength and Composition, *July 16*, 59.
Arms and Ammunition—Exportation to China, *July 24*, 1041.
British Forces—Naval and Military Reinforcements, *July 20*, 640.
Chinese Representatives in England, Official Recognition, etc., *July 23*, 852; *July 27*, 1499.
Despatch from the Emperor of China, *July 16*, 60.
Foreigners, Assisting to Escape, *July 19*, 454.
Japanese Troops, Number Landed, etc., *July 19*, 455.
Papers Relating to—Laying on the Table, *July 16*, 61; *July 26*, 1298.
Peking Legations, *July 17*, 218; *July 23*, 830.
Measures adopted for protection of, etc., *July 16*, 60.
Reported Massacre of Europeans, *July 16*, 58.
Shan-si—Reported Massacre of Missionaries, *July 20*, 642.
Tientsin—Engagements on July 9th and 11th, *July 16*, 58; *July 17*, 218.
Warren, Mr., Consul-General at Shanghai — Appointment as Chargé d'Affaires proposed, *July 20*, 641; *July 24*, 1041.
Yang-tsze Provinces
Holding Troops in Readiness at Hong Kong, *July 20*, 642.
Viceroys Maintaining Order—Support of Her Majesty's Government, *July 19*, 456; *July 23*, 852.

Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John—*cont.*
China—*cont.*
British Gunboats on the Yang-tsze—Number and Class of Boats, etc., *July 20*, 643.
"Kowshing" Claims — Arbitration, *July 26*, 1315.
Madagascar—Infraction of British Trade Rights by France, Reply to Representations, *July 19*, 464.
St. Petersburg Herring Trade—Facilities for Discharge and Storage, *July 16*, 71.

Brompton and Piccadilly Circus Railway Bill
c. Bill Withdrawn, *July 23*, 846.

Brownrigg, Colonel
South Denes Volunteer Camp, *see* that title.

Brunner, Sir J. T. [Cheshire, Northwich]
Volunteers Bill, *Com.*, *July 23*, 955, 959.

Bryce, Rt. Hon. J. [Aberdeen, S.]
"Avondale Castle," Transport to South Africa—Canteen Prices, *July 19*, 457.
Companies Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1065, 1080, 1099, 1106, 1108, 1120, 1134.
Irish Language, Use of in Irish Schools in place of English, *July 20*, 700.
South African War—Policy of the Colonial Secretary, Settlement after the War, etc., *July 25*, 1255.

Buchanan, Mr. T. R. [Aberdeenshire, E.]
Agricultural Holdings Bill, 3R., *July 29*, 532.
Business of the House—Supply, etc., *July 16*, 110.
India
Army
Commander-in-Chief — Filling vacant Appointment, *July 19*, 469.
Troops withdrawn from Establishment for service outside India—Replacing Troops, etc., *July 17*, 218.
Famine—Advances to Ryots, *July 16*, 71.
Martial Law in Cape Colony—Date of last Trial for Treasonable Offence, *July 16*, 63.
Reserve Forces Bill, *Com.*, *July 23*, 965, 966.
Volunteers Bill, *Com.*, *July 23*, 956, 958, 961, 962.

Budget of India
see India—Finance.

Buenos Ayres
Trade Report Presented, *July 2* 588.

Buenos Ayres and Rosario Railway Bill
c. 2R.* *July 18*, 341.
Reported with Amendts., *July 24*, 1039.
Standing Orders, *July 23*, 846.

Bundoran Mails
Delay in Mails from Dublin, etc.
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 26*, 1334.

Burden of Empire
Obligations and Resources of the British Empire, etc.
O. Lord Salisbury, *July 20*, 617.

Burdett-Coutts, Mr. W. L. A. B. [Westminster]
South African War
Censorship of Letters and Telegrams, *July 27*, 1568, 1576.
Civil Surgeons Employed in Military Hospitals—Pledge of Secrecy, *July 20*, 644.
Hospital and Medical Arrangements, *July 27*, 1569.
Commission
Constitution of—Opportunity for Discussion, *July 17*, 222, 223, 224.
Powers to Enforce Attendance of Witnesses, etc., *July 24*, 1042.
Protection of Witnesses, etc., *July 24*, 1043.

Burghclere, Lord
Agricultural Holdings Bill, 2R., *July 24*, 994, 1002.

Burmese Woman
Rangoon Outrage—Command of the Royal West Kent Regiment
Q. Sir L. M'Iver; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *July 24*, 1052.

Burnley Corporation Bill
l. Commons Amendts.* *July 19*, 410.
c. Lords Amendts. to Commons Amendts.* *July 24*, 1037.

Burnley Miners
Check-Weighing Clauses
Q. Mr. Stanhope; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *July 26*, 1317.

Burns, Mr. J. [Battersea]
German Emperor's "Mailed Fist" Speech, *July 23*, 947.
Naval Reserve Bill, 2R., *July 23*, 968.
Post Office Sites (Re-committed) Bill, *Com.*, *July 18*, 395.
Volunteers Bill, 2R., *July 18*, 385; *Com.*, *July 23*, 945, 953, 964, 965.

Bury and District Water (Transfer) Bill
c. Con. July 18*, 341.
3R.* *July 23*, 845.
l. Commons Amendts.* *July 24*, 986.

Business of the House
Government Business—Motion to Suspend Standing Orders (Mr. A. J. Balfour), *July 16*, 95.
Statements (Mr. A. J. Balfour), *July 17*, 240; *July 19*, 485; *July 20*, 671; *July 23*, 888; *July 26*, 1343.
Supply—Additional Days
Motion (Mr. A. J. Balfour), *July 16*, 95.
Winding up of the Session
Statement (Mr. A. J. Balfour), *July 16*, 87—Debate, 95.

Butcher, Mr. J. G. [York]
Companies Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1127.
Irish Language, Use of, in Irish Schools in place of English, *July 20*, 759.

Buxton, Mr. S. C. [Tower Hamlets, Poplar]
British South Africa Company—Transfer of Territory to the Crown, Negotiations, *July 19*, 463.
Colonial Stock Bill, 2R., *July 23*, 974.
South African War
Cape Rebels, Punishment of, etc., *July 25*, 1164, 1190, 1191, 1193, 1194.
Papers relating to, Laying on the Table, *July* 19, 461.
Settlement after the War, *July 25*, 1171.

Cable Communication
Imperial Telegraphic Communication—Committee of Inquiry, Constitution and Terms of Reference
Q. Sir E. Sassoon; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 23*, 867.
West Indies—Want of Direct Communication with other Islands, Dependence on Foreign Cables, etc.
Q. Mr. Tomlinson; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *July 19*, 464.
Yang-tsze Cable—Financial Arrangement, Working of Cable by British Staff, etc.
Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Sir M. H. Beach, *July 17*, 219.

Cadogan, Trial of
Cork Assizes—Selection of Jurymen
Q. Mr. Flynn; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *July 23*, 884.

Cahir Post Office
Scheme for Erecting New Office
Q. Mr. Mandeville; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 26*, 1332.

Cahirciveen
Perch or Buoy, Erection of, proposed—Lighthouse Authority, etc.
Q. Capt. Donelan; *A.* Mr. Plunkett, *July 23*, 886.

Caldwell, Mr. J. [Lanark, Mid]
Channel Fleet—Visit to Invergordon, proposed, *July 23*, 862.
Colonial Stock Bill, 2R., *July 23*, 972.
County Courts (Investment of Deposits) Bill, *Con.*, *July 19*, 583.
Education Grants
Fee Grant, Scotland, Payments on basis of Equivalent Grants, *July 17*, 236.
Grants paid in respect of the operations of the Education (Scotland) Act, *July 20*, 658.
Voluntary Schools Act and Elementary Education Act, 1897, Grants under, *July 20*, 658.
Elementary School Teachers' Superannuation (Isle of Man) Bill, 2R., *July 26*, 1447.
Imitation of County Court Process Bill, 2R., *July 23*, 975.
Inver Water Supply—Delay in completing Works, *July 23*, 877.
Lewis, Island of—Delay in construction of Roads, *July 23*, 876.
Lunacy Board (Scotland) (Salaries, etc.) Bill, *Con.*, *July 19*, 583.
Military Lands Bill, 2R., *July 23*, 897.
Naval Reserve Bill, *Com.*, *July 26*, 1445, 1446, 1447.
Oil in Tobacco Bill, 2R., *July 18*, 402.
Post Office Sites Bill, *Com.*, *July 18*, 387, 390, 393, 396, 398, 400, 401, 402; 3R., *July 19*, 582.
Public Works Loans Bill, *Com.*, *July 23*, 981, 983.
Reserve Forces Bill, *Con.*, *July 25*, 1162, 1163.

Caledonian Railway Bill
c. 2R.* *July 16*, 53.
Reported with Amendts., *July 27*, 1496.

Camberwell Guardians
Deportation of Irish Paupers—Case of J. Jones
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *July 16*, 78.

Camden Fort
Gun Fatality—Death of Gunner J. Addis
Qs. Mr. Flynn; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 20*, 647; *July 26*, 1304; *July 27*, 1507.

Campbell-Bannerman, Rt. Hon. Sir H. [Stirling Burghs]
Army
Reserve Stores, *July 27*, 1556.
Supplementary Estimate—War Expenditure, *July 27*, 1555.
Business of the House, *July 26*, 1343.
Winding up of the Session, *July 16*, 87, 89, 91, 95.

Campbell-Bannerman, Rt. Hon. Sir H.—*cont.*

China—Anti-Foreign Movement, *July 16*, 57 ; *July 23*, 849.

Military Lands Bill, 2R., *July 23*, 917.

Naval Reserve Bill, 2R., *July 23*, 967.

Naval Ships and Water-tube Boilers, Committee of Inquiry, etc., *July 17*, 261.

Reserve Forces Bill, 2R., *July 18*, 386.

South African War

Chamberlain, Mr., and the Policy of the Government, Attack on, *July 25*, 1229.

Civil Surgeons Employed in Military Hospitals — Pledge of Secrecy, alleged, *July 20*, 644.

Despatches, Publication of, *July 23*, 855, 856.

Withholding Information, *July 27*, 1556.

Martial Law administration, *July 25*, 1235.

Punishment of Rebels—Disfranchisement, etc., *July 25*, 1237, 1239.

Settlement after the War, *July 25*, 1234.

Military Administration, *July 25*, 1198.

Volunteers Bill, 2R., *July 18*, 359, 365, 368, 382, 383 ; *Com.*, *July 23*, 931, 934, 954, 955, 956, 958.

Forcing the Bill through the House under Pressure, etc., *July 16*, 96.

Camperdown, Earl of

Agricultural Holdings Bill, 2R., *July 24*, 996, 1001 ; *Com.*, *July 27*, 1483, 1487.

Peers, Attendance on Committees—Motion for Return, *July 17*, 196.

Town Councils (Scotland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 20*, 592.

Canada

Colonial Naval Reserve—General French's Proposal, etc.

Os. Viscount Frankfort, *July 19*, 439 ; Marquess of Lansdowne, 443.

Copyright Bill

O. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 16*, 97.

Exports to Germany—Exclusion of Canada from the Most Favoured Nation Treatment

Q. General Laurie ; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 26*, 1343.

Indian Famine—Government Grant proposed

Q. Sir W. Wedderburn ; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *July 24*, 1052.

South African War Contingent, *see* South African War.

Canterbury, Archbishop of

Education Bill, 2R., *July 23*, 809.

Ritualism in the Church—Continued Lawlessness in Spite of the Decision of Ecclesiastical Authorities, *July 16*, 18.

Canterbury, Archbishop of

Indian Famine Appeal

O. Sir M. Bhownaggree, *July 26*, 1404.

Cape Colony

Affairs of—Correspondence Presented, *July 17*, 192, 217.

Martial Law, Rebels, etc., *see* South African War—Martial Law, Rebels, etc.

Military and Sanitary Arrangements—Sir W. Foster's Suggestions, *see* South African War—Sanitary Arrangements.

Ministerial Crisis, Papers relating to—Laying on the Table

Q. Captain Sinclair ; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *July 16*, 63.

South African War, *see* that title.

Carden, Mr.

Successful Candidate for Assistant Surveyorship of Buildings, Ireland—Rejection

Q. Sir G. Fardell ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 19*, 475.

Carmody, Edmond

Mitigation of Sentence

Q. Mr. Flavin ; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 16*, 85.

Carrickmacross Workhouse

Number of Admission—Tramps, Casuals, etc.

Q. Mr. Daly ; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 26*, 1330.

Carrington, Earl

Colonies, Patriotism of — Equality between Imperial and Colonial Forces, *July 19*, 447.

Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill, 2R., *July 20*, 627, 635.

South African War, Medals for the Colonial Troops, *July 26*, 1289.

Carson, Sir E. [Dublin University]

Companies Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1079, 1107.

Cartwright, Sergeant

Lance Exhibition—Claim

Q. Mr. P. Pease ; *A.* Mr. J. P. Williams, *July 16*, 67.

Castlebar
Post Office—Site for new Office
Q. Dr. R. Ambrose; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 20*, 667.

Catalogues
Sale of, on Sunday in Public Institutions
Q. Mr. Massey-Mainwaring; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 16*, 86.

Cattle
Indian Famine—Mortality among Cattle, etc., *see* India—Famine.
Irish Cattle, Landing at Port of London prohibited
Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 16*, 81.
Railways—Providing Water for Cattle
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *July 23*, 873.
Tuberculosis, Case of, on West Cheshire Farm—Action of Medical Officers of Health
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Chaplin, *July 24*, 1054.
Warble Fly, Precautions against—Issue of Leaflet, etc.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Plunkett, *July 20*, 670.

Causton, Mr. R. K. [Southwark, W.]
Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill
Select Com., *July 16*, 49, 52.

Cavalry
Officers—Money Competency, "No man but a rich man can enter the Army"—Cavalry "Scandal"
O. Mr. E. Robertson, *July 27*, 1614.

Cawley, Mr. F. [Lancs., Prestwich]
Companies Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1141.
Volunteers Bill, *Com.*, *July 23*, 944.

Cecil, Lord H. [Greenwich]
Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill
Select Com., *July 16*, 42, 48.
South African War—Chaplains, Insufficient Supply, *July 19*, 462.

Cecil, Mr. E. [Herts, Hertford]
Durham (County of) Electric Power Supply Bill, *Con.*, *July 16*, 41.
London School Board Audit Case—Delay in Submitting to Queen's Bench, *July 23*, 870.
Science and Art Instruction in London Board Schools—Duplicate Registration and the Board of Education Grant, *July 24*, 1057, 1058.
South African War—Settlement after the War, etc., *July 25*, 1212.

Celtic Language
Use of in Irish Schools, *see* Irish Language.

Celtic Manuscripts
Royal Irish Academy—Grant in Aid fo Salary of Irish Scribe and Printing Manuscripts, etc.
Q. Mr. Dillon; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 19*, 479.

Censorship of Letters and Telegrams
see South African War.

Censure
Sutton to Censure Railway—Method of Construction, etc.
Q. Mr. T. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *July 26*, 1339.

Census
Irish Language Statistics
Q. Mr. T. D. Sullivan; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 20*, 660.

Central Telegraph Office
Overtime—Appointment of Additional Telegraphists, etc.
Q. Mr. Woods; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 19*, 472.
Punishment for exceeding Dinner Interval, etc.
Q. Mr. Steadman; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 20*, 656.

Certification of Deaths
see Death Certification.

Ceylon
Despatch of Boer Prisoners to—Number, etc.
Q. Capt. Sinclair; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 23*, 857.

Chairman of Committee
see Lowther, Rt. Hon. J. W.

Chamberlain of the City of London
Annual Accounts Presented, *July 27*, 1498.

Chamberlain, Col. N.
Inspector General of the Royal Irish Constabulary, Appointment
Qs. Mr. Flavin, Mr. Dillon; *As.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 16*, 85; *Qs.* Mr. Flavin, Mr. S. MacNeill, Mr. Flynn; *As.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 17*, 238.

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J.—*Secretary of State for the Colonies* [Birmingham, W.]
Africa, South—Blue-book, Publication of Newspaper Correspondence, *July 20*, 645.
Ashanti Rising—Investment of Coomassie, Progress of Relief Column, etc., *July 16*, 70; *July 17*, 230.

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J.—*cont.*
Australasian Commonwealth—Governor General's Official Residence, etc., *July 16*, 69 ; *July 20*, 652.
Australian Northern Territory—Annexation to South Australia in 1863, etc., *July 24*, 1050.
British Central Africa Rifles, Misconduct of at Mauritius—Laying Papers on the Table, *July 20*, 651.
British South Africa Company—Transfer of Territory to the Crown—Negotiations, *July 19*, 463.
Cape Colony—Ministerial Crisis—Laying Papers on the Table, *July 16*, 63.
Indian Famine—Canadian Government Grant proposed, *July 24*, 1052.
Johannesburg—Resumption of Industrial Occupations, *July 27*, 1500.
Niger Coast Protectorate—Spirit Import Duties, *July 23*, 867.
South African War
Future Administration of South Africa, *July 25*, 1197.
Johannesburg, Court of Chief Magistrate Tribunal, etc., *July 19*, 461.
Loyalists' Losses in Natal, Compensation, *July 17*, 220.
Martial Law—Administration in Cape Colony, etc.
Botha, Mr. J., Arrest of, *July 16*, 63.
Date of last Trial for Treasonable Offence, *July 16*, 64.
Detention of Prisoners in Civil or Military Prisons, etc., *July 16*, 64 ; *July 17*, 221.
Proclaimed Districts — Cape Colony and Rhodesia, *July 27*, 1501.
Withdrawal of Proclamation, *July 26*, 1301.
Policy of the Government, Defence of, etc., *July 25*, 1186.
Rebels
Papers Relating to, Laying on the Table, *July 19*, 461.
Punishment of — Disfranchisement, etc., *July 25*, 1178.
Tonga Islands—Proclamation of British Protectorate, *July 24*, 1051.
West Indies — Cable Communication, Want of direct Communication, Dependence on Foreign Cables, etc., *July 19*, 464.

Chamberlain's, Mr., South African Policy
Attack on
Debate in Com. of Supply, *July 25*, 1164.

Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster
Lord James of Hereford.

Chancellor of the Exchequer
Sir M. H. Beach.

Channel Fleet
Cruises, Nature and Extent of, Sea-Training, etc.—Admiral's Reports
Q. Sir J. Colomb ; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *July 24*, 1048.
Training of Officers—Amount of Sea Service, etc.
Os. Sir J. Colomb, Mr. Goschen, *July 17*, 339, 340.
Visit to Invergordon proposed
Q. Mr. Caldwell ; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *July 23*, 862.

Channel Islands
Teachers' Superannuation—Legislation
Q. Mr. Yoxall ; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley *July 16*, 71.
(*see also* title of Bill.)

Channing, Mr. F. A. [Northampton, E.]
Agricultural Holdings Bill, 3R., *July 19*, 561.
Business of the House
Bills Dropped, etc., *July 16*, 103, 114.
Supply, *July 16*, 92.
Dogs—Importation into Great Britain Regulations, *July 27*, 1512.
Local Taxation Returns—Delay in Printing and Circulating, *July 27*, 1514.
Military Lands Bill, 2R., *July 23*, 915.
South African War—Inoculation against Enteric Fever, Results, *July 24*, 1045.

Chaplains
see titles Army, Navy, and South African War.

Chaplin, Rt. Hon. H.—*President of the Local Government Board* [Lincolnshire, Sleaford]
Didsbury Voluntary School Rate, *July 26*, 1317.
Dorking Local Government Board supplying *Dorking Advertiser* with letter addressed to Rural District Council, *July 16*, 73.
Feeble-minded Paupers, Number and Condition of—Inquiry proposed, *July 24*, 1053.
Food Preservatives—Report of Departmental Committee, *July 26*, 1316.
Pauper Children
Receiving Home, Establishment of at Lambeth — Local Government Board suggestion, *July 24*, 1053.
Religious Instruction—Non-appointment of Church of England Chaplain for Rockhall and Rochford House, *July 17*, 232.
Wandsworth Board of Guardians—Offer of free Pardon to Parents reclaiming Deserted Children, *July 24*, 1054.
Tuberculosis—Case of, on West Cheshire Farm, *July 24*, 1055.
Vaccine Lymph—Bacterial impurity, *July 26*, 1316.

Charing Cross and Strand Electricity Supply Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *July 23*, 785
3R.* *July 26*, 1266.

Charitable Loans (Ireland) Bill
l. Reported without Amendts., *July 17*, 192.
3R.* *July 19*, 420.

Chatting, F. J.
Vaccination Prosecution
Q. Mr. L. Sinclair; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *July 16*, 72.

Check-Weighing Clauses
Burnley Miners
Q. Mr. Stanhope; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *July 26*, 1317.

Chefoo
Trade Report Presented, *July 17*, 192.

Chelsea Hospital
Gardens—Closing at eight instead of nine o'clock, etc.
Q. Mr. Massey-Mainwaring; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 16*, 67.

Cheshire
Tuberculosis, Case of, on West Cheshire Farm—Action of Medical Officers of Health
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Chaplin, *July 24*, 1054.

Chief Secretary for Ireland
Rt. Hon. G. W. Balfour.

Children
Pauper Children, *see* that title.
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children Bills, *see* their titles.

Chile
Trade Report Presented, *July 20*, 588.

China
Anti-Foreign Rising, etc.
Allied Forces
Command
Q. Mr. Dillon; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *July 16*, 60.
Strength and Composition
O. Mr. Brodrick, *July 16*, 59.
Arms and Ammunition, Exporting to China, *see* title Arms and Ammunition.
British Forces
Hospital Accommodation at Weihai-wei
Q. Mr. Hedderwick; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *July 23*, 853.

China—*cont.*
Anti-Foreign Rising, etc.—*cont.*
British Forces—*cont.*
Hospital Ship—Maharajah of Gwalior's Offer
O. Lord G. Hamilton, *July 23*, 853; *Os.* Sir H. Fowler, *July 26*, 1369; Mr. Maclean, 1390; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 1428.
Inadequate Provision for upholding British Rights and Interests
O. Mr. J. Walton, *July 27*, 1599.
Indian Contingent
Qs. Mr. Maclean, Mr. Buchanan; *As.* Lord G. Hamilton, *July 17*, 218.
Cost, etc.
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *July 19*, 455.
Reinforcements, Naval and Military
Q. Mr. J. Walton; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *July 20*, 640.
Supplementary Estimate—Mr. Wyndham's Statement, *July 27*, 1525.
(*see also* sub-heading Peking—British Marine Guard.)
Chinese Representatives in England, Official Recognition of
Q. Mr. Hedderwick; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *July 23*, 852; *Q.* Mr. Warner; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *July 27*, 1499.
Despatch from the Emperor of China—Laying on the Table
Q. Mr. Dillon; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *July 16*, 60.
Foreigners in the Interior—Assisting to Escape
Q. Mr. J. Walton; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *July 19*, 453.
Japanese Troops—Number landed in China, etc.
Q. Mr. H. Roberts; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *July 19*, 455.
Papers—Laying on the Table
Q. Mr. Dillon; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *July 16*, 61; *Q.* Earl of Kimberley; *A.* Marquess of Salisbury, *July 23*, 796; *Q.* Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *July 26*, 1298.
Correspondence Presented, *July 27*, 1458, 1498.
Peking
British Legation, Safety of, etc.
Q. Mr. P. Morgan; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *July 17*, 218.
British Marine Guard—Names of Officers and men
Q. Sir J. Colomb; *A.* Mr. Macartney, *July 19*, 454; *Q.* Sir J. Colomb; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *July 23*, 853.

China—*cont.*
Anti-Foreign Rising, etc.—*cont.*
Peking—*cont.*
Massacre of Europeans Reported
Q. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *July 16*, 57.
Protection of Legations, Measures adopted for
Q. Mr. Maclean; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *July 16*, 59; *Q.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *July 23*, 849.
Settlement after Hostilities are over
O. Mr. J. Walton, *July 27*, 1600.
Seymour's, Adm., Relief Force—Date of Commencement of March
Q. Mr. Maclean; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *July 16*, 59.
Shan-si—Reported Massacre of Missionaries
Q. Mr. J. Wilson; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *July 20*, 642.
Shipbuilding, Construction of Ironclads, etc., by British Firms—Legislation
Q. Col. Pilkington; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 23*, 853.
Tientsin—Attacks by Allied Forces
Q. Sir H. Fowler; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *July 17*, 218.
Engagements on July 9th and 11th—Gen. Dorward's Telegrams
Q. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *July 16*, 57.
Warren, Mr., Consul-General at Shanghai — Appointment as Chargé d'Affaires, proposed
Q. Mr. Yerburgh; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *July 20*, 641; *Q.* Sir E. Sassoon; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *July 24*, 1040.
Wei-hai-wei—Hospital Accommodation
Q. Mr. Hedderwick; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *July 23*, 853.
Yang-tsze Provinces
Holding Troops in readiness at Hong-Kong
Q. Mr. Yerburgh; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *July 20*, 642.
Viceroys maintaining Order—Support of Her Majesty's Government
Qs. Mr. Yerburgh; *As.* Mr. Brodrick, *July 19*, 455; *July 23*, 851.
Arms and Ammunition, Exportation to China by English Firms, *see* title Arms and Ammunition.
British Gunboats on Inland Waterways for the Protection of British Traders, etc.
Qs. Mr. J. Walton; *As.* Mr. Goschen, *July 17*, 334, 335.
Number and Class of Boats
Q. Mr. J. Walton; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *July 20*, 642.

China—*cont.*
British Trade — Burden of defending British Position, etc.
O. Lord Salisbury, *July 20*, 617.
Hong Kong, *see* that title.
"Kowshing" Claims
Q. Sir M. Stewart; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *July 26*, 1315.
Peking, *see* sub-heading Anti-Foreign Rising.
Russian and German Aggression
O. Mr. J. Walton, *July 27*, 1600.
Trade Report Presented, *July 17*, 192.
Yang-tsze Provinces, *see* sub-heading Anti-Foreign Rising.
Yang-tsze River
British Gun Boats, *see* that sub-heading.
Cable to Wei-hai-wei — Financial Arrangement, Working of Cable by British Staff, etc.
Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Sir M. H. Beach, *July 17*, 219.

Chiromo
Railway to Lake Nyassa, Construction of —Government Loan proposed
Q. Sir B. Gurdon; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *July 20*, 651.

Cholera
see India.

Christchurch and Bournemouth Tramways Bill
l. Reported with Amendts., *July 27*, 1449.

Church of England
Ritualism—Continued Lawlessness in spite of Decision of the Archbishops, etc.
Debate (Lords), *July 16*, 10—(*for* details, *see* Ritualism).

City of London
Finances of the Corporation—Chamberlain's Report, *July 27*, 1498.

City of London (Various Powers) Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *July 20*, 585.
3R.* *July 26*, 1266.

Civil Service
Abstractors—Terms of Service
Q. Sir T. Esmonde; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 27*, 1519.
Examinations—Junior Civil Service Examination Rules
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 26*, 1329.
Retired Allowances—Treasury Minutes Presented, *July 16*, 8, 5, 6; *July 19*, 414, 453.

Civil Service Commission
Report with Appendix Presented, *July 20*, 588, 639.

Civil Service Estimates
see Supply.

Civil Surgeons
Employment of, in South Africa, *see* South African War—Hospital and Medical Arrangements.

Clancy, Mr. J. J. [Dublin Co., N.]
Intermediate Education (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *July 19*, 516, 517.

Clare
Fishing Industry in West Clare, Development of—Proposed Grant
Q. Major Jameson ; *A.* Mr. Plunkett, *July 24*, 1063.

Clergy
Disobedience, *see* Ritualism in the Church.

Clonbrock, Lord
Tithe Rent-charge (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *July 19*, 427 ; *Rep.*, *July 26*, 1279.

Cloncurry, Lord
Tithe Rent-charge (Ireland) Bill, *Rep.*, *July 26*, 1275.

Clones
Level Crossing and Platform—Report of Inspector
Q. Mr. Macaleese ; *A.* Mr. J. Collings, *July 17*, 239.
Water Supply—Dissatisfaction as to quality of Water
Q. Mr. Macaleese ; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 26*, 1336.

Clontarf Urban District Council Bill
l. Report from Joint Committee, *July 20*, 588.
c. Report from Joint Committee, *July 20*, 637.
*Con.** and 3R.* *July 26*, 1295.
l. 1R.* *July 26*, 1267.

Coagh Postal Service
Defects, etc.
Q. Mr. Doogan ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 26*, 1333.

Coal
Belgium Coal Industry — Report Presented, *July 17*, 192.
Exportation of to Foreign Countries, British and American Exports—Statistics
Q. Mr. D. A. Thomas ; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *July 20*, 654.
Exportation of British Coal
France, Increase in Exports
Q. Mr. Harwood ; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 26*, 1313.
Prohibiting
Q. Mr. Firbank ; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 26*, 1313.
Navy, Supply of Coal for, *see* Navy.
Rise in Price, Increased Purchase by Foreign Competition, etc.
Q. Sir H. Vincent ; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *July 27*, 1511.

Coghill, Mr. D. H. [Stoke-upon-Trent]
Piccadilly, Widening, *July 24*, 1059.

Cohen, Mr. B. L. [Islington, E.]
Colonial Stock Bill, 2R., *July 23*, 971.
House of Commons Committee Rooms—Outside Blinds, *July 26*, 1325.
Letter-boxes with two Compartments—Number in East Central District, etc., *July 16*, 75.

Coinage
Annual Report of Deputy Master and Comptroller of the Mint Presented, *July 16*, 8, 56.
Silver Coinage — Crowns and Double Florins, Continuing Issue of
Q. Mr. W. F. D. Smith ; *A.* Sir M. H. Beach, *July 19*, 469.

Collings, Rt. Hon. J.—*Under Secretary, Home Office* [Birmingham, Bordesley]
Clones Level Crossing and Platform—Inspector's Report, *July 17*, 239.
Elementary School Teachers' Superannuation (Isle of Man) Bill, 2R., *July 26*, 1447.
Fire Brigades Committee Report, Publication of in the *Times* previous to laying on the Table, *July 20*, 655.
Gas Order Confirmation (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *July 17*, 213, 214.
Jury Service—Exemptions, Payment of Common Jurymen, etc., *July 17*, 235.
Mercantile Marine—Belleville Boilers on British Steamers, *July 17*, 229.
Private Bill Legislation, Cost of—Delay in Presenting Return, *July 17*, 235.

Colomb, Adm. Sir J. [Great Yarmouth]
Army Reserve Stores—Distribution of Producing Power, etc., *July 27*, 1553.
Cordite Reserve, *July 17*, 337.
China — Anti-Foreign Rising — British Marine Guard at Peking, Names of Officers and Men, *July 19*, 454 ; *July 23*, 853.
Great Yarmouth Fishermen and the Militia, *July 27*, 1507.
House of Commons Committee Rooms—Ventilation, etc., *July 26*, 1325.
Naval Reserve Bill, *Com.*, *July 26*, 1446.
Navy
Mediterranean and Channel Fleet, Nature and Extent of Cruises, etc., Admirals' Reports, *July 24*, 1048.
Non-Inflammable Wood, Use of, in Construction of Naval Ships, *July 17*, 247.
Officers—Amount of Sea Service in the Channel and Mediterranean Squadrons, *July 17*, 339 ; *July 24*, 1048.
Shipbuilding, etc.—Development of Producing Power, *July 17*, 303.
Water-tube Boilers on Naval Ships, *July 17*, 302.

Colomb, Adm. Sir J.—*cont.*
Old Age Pensions for Soldiers, *July 27*, 1553.
South African War—Inquiry into Surrenders, etc., *July 27*, 1552.
Tithe Rent-charge (Ireland) Bill, *Re-com.*, *July 16*, 137, 138.
Volunteers Bill, 2R., *July 18*, 371.

Colonial Marriages Bill
Dropped Bill
O. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 16*, 97.

Colonial Office
Secretary of State — Rt. Hon. J. Chamberlain.
Parliamentary Secretary—Earl of Selborne.
Vote for, *July 25*, 1164—(*for* subjects discussed, *see* their titles.)

Colonial Stock Bill
c. 1R.* *July 17*, 240.
2R., *July 23*, 969.

Colonial Stock Bill
Debate on Second Reading, *July 23*, 969.
London Gazette, Publishing particulars of Treasury Conditions, 973, 974.
Register — Inscribing Stock upon Register kept in England, 973.
Stock Issued previous to the passing of the Act, Particulars required, etc., 972.
Trustees—Treasury Control, Conditions, etc., 970, 971, 972, 974.

Colonies
Copyright and Colonial Marriages Bills—Bills Dropped by the Government
O. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 16*, 97.
Defence of the Empire
Army Questions, *see* title Army—Colonies.
Colonial Contribution towards the Navy
O. Mr. E. Robertson, *July 17*, 330.
Reserve Forces of Australasia—Proposed Enrolment of Colonial Naval Reserve, etc.
Debate (Lords), *July 19*, 435.
Scheme for—Help of the Colonies, etc.
O. Duke of Bedford, *July 17*, 198.
Patriotism of the Colonies
Os. Lord Brassey, *July 19*, 439; Marquess of Lansdowne, 441; Earl Carrington, 447.
South African War Contingents, *see* South African War.
Troops, Interchange of Imperial and Colonial Troops
O. Marquess of Lansdowne, *July 19*, 447.
(*see also* Names of Colonies.)

Comforts for the Troops
see South African War—Gifts.

Commander-in-Chief
Military Statements in the House of Lords, suggestion
Os. Earl of Rosebery, *July 27*, 1470; Marquess of Lansdowne, 1473; Earl of Kimberley, 1477.

Commander-in-Chief in India
see India—Army.

Commins, Dr. A. [Cork County, S.E.]
Reformatory and Industrial Schools, Ireland—Chief Secretary's Circular, *July 20*, 780.

Committal for Contempt of Court
see Contempt of Court.

Committee Rooms
see House of Commons.

Committees
Peers, Attendance of
Return — Motion (Earl of Camperdown), *July 17*, 196.
Public Accounts Committee—Report with Minutes of Evidence and Appendix Presented, *July 25*, 1162.
Public Petitions Committee—Report Presented, *July 25*, 1162.
Selection (Standing Committees)—Members Discharged and Members Appointed in Substitution, *July 18*, 343; *July 26*, 1344.
Standing Orders, Resolutions Reported from Committee, *July 16*, 54; *July 23*, 785.

Commonwealth of Australia
see Australasian Commonwealth.

Companies
Rate of Income Tax Chargeable on Interest paid by Public Companies
Q. Sir A. Hickman; *A.* Sir M. H. Beach, *July 19*, 470.

Companies Bill
c. Report from Standing Committee on Trade, *July 19*, 486.
Con., *July 24*, 1065.

Companies Bill
Debate on Consideration as Amended, etc., *July 24*, 1065.
Bogus Subscriptions, Allotment Return, etc., 1091, 1092, 1093, 1094.
Brokerage, Commission on—Limit, Disclosing Amount, etc., 1117, 1118 1119, 1120, 1123, 1125.
Capital—Minimum Amount, Allotment on Insufficient Capital, etc., 1085, 1086, 1087, 1088, 1089, 1091.
Insertion of Minimum Capital in Prospectus and in Articles of Association or Memorandum, 1089, 1090, 1094, 1104.

Companies Bill—*cont.*
Debate on Consideration as Amended—*cont.*
Chemists, Dentists, and Druggists, 1067, 1068.
Companies Commencing Business—Conditions, Issue of Shares, etc., 1101, 1102, 1103, 1104, 1145.
Definition of Business allowed to be carried on by a Company, 1065, 1066, 1067, 1068.
Directors
Liability, Limit of Period, etc., 1096, 1097, 1098, 1099, 1100.
Qualifications, 1069, 1070, 1071, 1072, 1073, 1080.
Failure of Bank in which money received from Applicants for Shares was Deposited, 1090.
Investors, Protection of, 1075, 1076, 1077, 1078, 1079, 1084, 1086, 1087, 1149, 1150.
"Invitation to the Public" to take up Shares, 1075, 1077, 1082, 1104, 1105.
Joint Stock Companies, 1076, 1078, 1086.
One Man Companies, 1146.
Passing Bill this Session—References to in Debate on the Suspension of Standing Orders, *July 16*, 103, 104, 106, 107, 108, 109, 113, 114.
Private Companies, Application of the Bill to, 1077, 1078, 1079, 1080, 1081, 1106, 1107, 1129, 1131, 1134, 1135, 1147, 1148, 1149.
Prospectuses and Memoranda, Issue of, 1074, 1075, 1077, 1078, 1079, 1080, 1113, 1145, 1148, 1149, 1153, 1155, 1156, 1158.
Public and Private Companies, Distinguishing between, 1077, 1078, 1106, 1129, 1131, 1132, 1133, 1134, 1135.
Shares
Allotment Returns, 1107, 1108.
Amount Payable on Application, etc., 1091, 1094, 1095.
First and subsequent Issues of Shares, 1091, 1092, 1093, 1094.
Underwriting Shares, Commissions to Underwriters—Disclosing Amount of Commission in Prospectus, etc., 1109, 1111, 1112, 1114, 1116, 1117, 1118, 1121, 1123, 1124, 1125, 1126, 1127, 1134, 1135, 1139, 1140, 1141, 1142, 1143, 1158, 1159, 1160.

Compensation for Damage to Crops Bill
c. Bill Withdrawn, *July 17*, 240.

Constabulary, Royal Irish
Batons and Handcuffs—Place of Manufacture, Cost, etc.
Q. Mr. T. M. Healy ; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 23*, 878

Constabulary, Royal Irish—*cont.*
Chamberlain, Col. N.—Inspector General, Appointment
Qs. Mr. Flavin, Mr. Dillon ; *As.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 16*, 85 ; *Qs.* Mr. Flavin, Mr. S. MacNeill, Mr. Flynn; *As.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 17*, 238.
House Rent Allowances
Q. Mr. M. Healy ; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 23*, 880.
Kilteevan—Drum and Fife Band Demonstrations, Police Interference
Q. Mr. Hayden ; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 23*, 880.
Queenstown, Police Landing Regulations—Asking American Passengers for Name and Destination, etc.
Q. Mr. Hayden ; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 20*, 666.
Sands', J., Farm near Listowel, Protection of—Number of Police Employed, Cost, etc.
Q. Mr. Flavin ; *A.* Mr. G.W. Balfour, *July 19*, 478.
Sneem—Extra Police Force—Protection of Mr. Warden's House, etc.
Qs. Mr. Flavin, Mr. Flynn ; *As.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 19*, 481.
Tipperary and Limerick, Medical Appointment for—Neglecting to consult wishes of the Police
Q. Mr. T. M. Healy ; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 19*, 474.

Consul General Warren
see China—Anti-Foreign Rising—Warren.

Contagious Diseases
India—Petition for alteration of Law *July 20*, 638.

Contempt of Court
Judges' Power of Committal—Legislation proposed
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill ; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 23*, 887.
O'Brien, Mr. W., Case of
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill ; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 20*, 666.

Continental Powers and Great Britain
Hostility towards Great Britain—Necessity for Strong Military and Naval Defence—Lord Salisbury's Primrose League Speech
O. Earl of Kimberley, *July 27*, 1476.

Continuous Brakes
Report Presented, *July 23*, 795, 848.

Convict Prisons
see Prisons.

Cooke, Mr. C. W. R. [Hereford]
Companies Bill, *Com.*, *July 24*, 1065.
Volunteers Bill, *Com.*, *July 23*, 935.

Coomassie
see Ashanti.

Cootehill
Postmastership, Appointment of Chemist as Postmaster — Conditions attached to previous Appointment
Q. Mr. S. Young ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 19*, 472.

Copyright Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *July 19*, 415.
Com., *July 23*, 837.

Copyright Bill
Dropped Bill
Os. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 16*, 97.

Copyright (Artistic) Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *July 19*, 415.

Cordite
Erosion of Guns—Committee of Inquiry
Qs. Sir C. Dilke, Mr. Paulton ; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 17*, 226.
Explosion on Board the "Revenge"
O. Admiral Field, *July 17*, 338 ; *Q.* Admiral Field ; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *July 26*, 1310.
Reserve of Cordite for the Navy
O. Sir J. Colomb, *July 17*, 337.

Cork
Assizes
Case of Edmond Carmody—Mitigation of Sentence
Q. Mr. Flavin ; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 16*, 85.
Trial of Cadogan—Selection of Jurymen
Q. Mr. Flynn ; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *July 23*, 884.
Dogs—Muzzling Regulations
Q. Mr. M. Healy ; *A.* Mr. Plunkett, *July 27*, 1522.
Gun Fatality at Camden Fort, *see* Camden Fort.
Land Commission Sittings—Delay in hearing Fair Rent Appeals
Q. Mr. M. Healy ; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 24*, 1062.
Postal Arrangements—Establishment of Post Office at Dillon's Cross, etc.
Q. Mr. M. Healy ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 26*, 1335.
Queen's College—Report for Session 1899–1900, with Appendices, Presented, *July 18*, 342 ; *July 19*, 414.

Cork, Earl of
Cruelty to Wild Animals in Captivity Bill, 3R., *July 26*, 1284.

Cornalaragh
Postal Deliveries—House to House Delivery
Q. Mr. Daly ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 20*, 668.

Corngreaves Hall
Inebriate Reformatory — Rules as to Management Presented, *July 27*, 1458, 1498.

Costa Rica Railway Company, Limited, Bill
c. 2R.* *July 18*, 341.
Reported without Amendts., *July 24*, 1039.
Standing Orders, *July 23*, 846.

County Councils
Military Lands Act, 1892, Purchase of Land under—Number of Acres purchased, Amounts expended, etc.
Q. Capt. Sinclair; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 23*, 859.

County Courts
Fees—Report of Committee
Q. Sir C. Dilke ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 27*, 1519.
Imitation of County Court Process Bill, *see* that title.

County Courts Acts, Ireland
Administration — Traders' Grievances, Legislation, proposed
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien ; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *July 16*, 86.

County Courts (Investment of Deposits) Bill
*c. Com.** and *Rep.** *July 18*, 402.
Con. and 3R.* *July 19*, 583.
l. Commons Amendts.* *July 20*, 589.

County Courts (Ireland) Bill
l. Com., *July 16*, 39.
Reported without Amendts., *July 17*, 193.
3R.* *July 19*, 420.
c. 1R.* *July 23*, 889.
Bill Withdrawn, *July 26*, 1447.

County Courts (Ireland) Bill
Circulating Draft of Rules, Orders and Forms, proposed
Q. Mr. M. Healy ; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 23*, 878.

County Surveyors, Ireland
see Ireland—Surveyors.

County and Borough Franchise Assimilation (London) Bill
l. 2R., *July 17*, 193.
*Com.** and *Rep.** *July 20*, 589.
Reported without Amendts., *July 24*, 988.
3R.* *July 26*, 1275.

County and Borough Franchise Assimilation (London) Bill
Debate on Second Reading (Lords), *July 17*, 193.
Lodgers, Service Voters and Freeholders, Voting Rights, 194, 195.
Rating Bodies, Rights of, etc., 194, 195.
Registers — Putting Register for London County Council and London Borough Council on the same basis, 194.
Voting Qualifications—Period of Occupation, etc., 195.

Court of Appeal
see Appeal Court.

Courtney, Rt. Hon. L. H. [Cornwall, Bodmin]
Business of the House—Supply, *July 16*, 91.
South African War—Policy of the Colonial Secretary, Treatment of Rebels, Settlement after the War, etc., *July 25*, 1243.

Courts-martial
Martial Law in South Africa, *see* South African War.
Naval Courts-martial
Application of Criminal Evidence Act
Q. Mr. H. D. Greene; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *July 24*, 1049.
Return Presented, *July 16*, 7, 57.

Coventry Corporation Bill
l. 2R.* *July 19*, 410
Reported with Amendts, *July 26*, 1266.
Standing Orders, *July 16*, 1.

Cowshott Manor Camp
see Inniskilling Fusiliers.

Cranbrook, Earl of
Ritualism in the Church—Continued Lawlessness in spite of the Decision of Ecclesiastical Authorities, *July 16*, 24.

Crean, Mr. E. [Queen's Co., Ossory]
Irish Language, Use of in Irish Schools in place of English, *July 20*, 761.

Crimes and Outrages, Ireland
Agrarian Outrages—Return Presented, *July 20*, 588, 640.

Crimes and Outrages, Ireland—*cont.*
Monaghan—Absence of Crime, Removing Operation of Peace Preservation Act, proposed
Q. Mr. Daly; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 23*, 877.

Criminal Evidence Act
Naval Courts-martial—Application of Act
Q. Mr. H. D. Greene; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *July 24*, 1049.

Crops
Compensation for Damage to Crops Bill—*see* that title.

Cross, Viscount—*Lord Privy Seal*
Agricultural Holdings Bill, 2R., *July 24*, 988; *Com.*, *July 27*, 1481, 1484, 1487, 1488, 1492, 1494.
Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill, 2R., *July 20*, 631.
Oil in Tobacco Bill, 2R., *July 26*, 1285.
Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension Bill, *Com.*, *July 16*, 39.

Crowns
Coinage of
Q. Mr. W. F. D. Smith; *A.* Sir M. H. Beach, *July 19*, 469.

Croydon Tramways and Improvements Bill
l. Report from Committee of Selection, *July 16*, 3; *July 17*, 191.
Report from Select Committee and Bill Committed, *July 19*, 411.
Reported with Amendts., *July 23*, 785.
3R.* *July 26*, 1266.

Cruelty to Wild Animals in Captivity Bill
l. Reported without Amendts., *July17*, 193.
Reported with Amendts., *July 24*, 989.
3R., *July 26*, 1284.

Crystal Palace Company Bill
c. Report from Select Committee, *July 16*, 55.
2R.* *July 23*, 845.
Reported without Amendts., *July 24*, 1038.
3R.* *July 27*, 1495.

Cubitt, Mr. H. [Surrey, Reigate]
Dorking Local Government Board, Supplying *Dorking Advertiser* with Letter addressed to Rural District Council, *July 16*, 73.

Cumberland County Council (Bridges) Bill
l. Reported with Amendts., *July 17*, 189.
3R.* *July 26*, 1266.

Cunningham, Prof.
Appointment as Member of South African Hospital Commission, *see* South African War—Hospitals.

Currency
Gold Standard in India, *see* India—Gold Standard.
(*see also* Coinage.)

"Custodian"
Transport—Complaint against Provisions, etc., during Voyage from the Cape
Q. Mr. Paulton; *A.* Mr. Macartney, *July 19*, 457.

Customs
Prison-made Goods—Seizures of Foreign Goods, etc.
Q. Mr. Lambert; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 23*, 872.

Customs Watchers
Improved Condition of Service
Q. Mr. Steadman; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 26*, 1330.

Cylindrical Boilers
see Navy—Boilers, Water-Tube Boilers *versus* Cylindrical Boilers.

Dalkeith, Earl of [Roxburgh]
Residence of First Sea Lord, *July 17*, 340.

Daly, Mr. J. [Monaghan, S.]
Belfast Workhouse Mastership — Postponement of Appointment, etc., *July 20*, 661.
Carrickmacross Workhouse—Number of Admissions, Tramps, Casuals, etc., *July 26*, 1330.
Cornalaragh Postal Deliveries—House to house delivery, *July 20*, 668.
Dromore River Floods, *July 26*, 1331.
Greaghlone Letter-box — Neglecting to clear, *July 20*, 668.
Irish Language, Use of in Irish Schools in Place of English, *July 20*, 736.
Monaghan
Absence of Crime—Removing Operation of Peace Preservation Act, *July 23*, 877.
Asylum Works, *July 19*, 480; *July 20*, 660.

Dalziel, Mr. J. H. [Kirkcaldy Burghs]
China — Anti-Foreign Rising — British Government Policy, *July 27*, 1608.
Post Office Sites (Re-committed) Bill, *Com.*, *July 18*, 394.
War Expenditure—Inquiry into Disasters, Treatment of Wounded Soldiers, Pay of Soldiers at the Front, etc., *July 27*, 1604.

Dangerous Trades
Arsenic, *see* that title.

Dartrey, Earl of
County Courts (Ireland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 16*, 39.

Davey, Lord
Poor Law Removal Bill, 3R., *July 19*, 415.

De Ramsey, Lord
Agricultural Holdings Bill, 2R., *July 24*, 1008.

Dearne Valley Railway Bill
c. Con. July 16*, 53.
3R.* *July 19*, 450.

Death Certification
Legislation—Report of Committee, etc.
Os. Lord Monkswell, Lord Harris, *July 17*, 209.

Debentures and Income Tax
see Income Tax.

Debtors
Number of Debtors in Prison—Treatment, etc.
Q. Mr. J. A. Pease; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *July 19*, 470.

Debts
Method of Collecting—Imitation of County Court Process Bill, *see* that title.

Defective and Epileptic Children
Boarding-out—Regulation against Boarding out in the same Home with Poor Law Children
Q. Mr. Lawrence; *A.* Sir J. Gorst, *July 17*, 236.

Defence of the Empire
Australasia—Reserve Forces, Proposed Enrolment of Colonial Naval Reserve, etc.
Debate (Lords), *July 19*, 435—(*for* details, *see* Australasia—Defence).
Colonial Contribution towards the Navy
O. Mr. E. Robertson, *July 17*, 330.
Colonies and the New Imperial Defence Scheme
O. Duke of Bedford, *July 17*, 198.
Committee of the Cabinet for Defence—No Minutes kept of Proceedings, etc.
O. Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 27*, 1568.
Expert Information as to Home Defences—Commander-in-Chief making Statements in the House of Lords, suggestion
Os. Earl of Rosebery, *July 27*, 1470; Marquess of Lansdowne, 1473; Earl of Kimberley, 1477.

Defence of the Empire—*cont.*
Home Defence
Emergency Scheme, Cost of, etc.
Wyndham's, Mr., Statement, *July 27*, 1531.
(*see also* Volunteers.)
Navy and Home Defences
O. Earl of Wemyss, *July 27*, 1461.
Navy *v.* Army—"Wet Bob" and "Dry Bob" Schools
Os. Earl of Wemyss, *July 27*, 1461; Earl of Rosebery, 1471.
Strength and Organisation of Military Forces
Debate (Lords), *July 27*, 1458.
India Military Charges, *see* India—Finance, Expenditure Commission, etc.
India's Contribution—Comparison with the Colonies
O. Mr. Souttar, *July 26*, 1377.
Military Attaché's Warning—"All important that England should be strong and unassailable in the month of November"
Os. Earl of Wemyss, *July 27*, 1459; Marquess of Salisbury, 1463.
Military Needs of the Empire, etc.
Debate (Lords), *July 17*, 196.
Naval Programme, Insufficient Naval Programme for the Safety of the Empire
O. Sir C. Dilke, *July 17*, 272.
Salisbury's, Lord, Primrose League Speech, *see* Primrose League Meeting.

Denbigh, Earl of
Local Government Provisional Orders Bills, Suspension of Standing Orders, *July 16*, 6.
Shannon Water and Electric Power Bill—Fisheries Inspector's Report, *July 23*, 842.

Deportation of Paupers
see Paupers.

Derbyshire Assizes
Detention of Persons Awaiting Trial—Mr. Justice Wright's Statement
Q. Mr. Hazell; *A.* Sir R. Finlay, *July 23*, 875.

Derry
see Londonderry.

Devizes Prison
Warder Hargrave's Pension—Decision of the Treasury, Apportioning between Imperial and Local Funds
Q. Mr. Goulding; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 16*, 74.

Devon, North
Night Mail Service—Delays, Improvement of Train Service, etc.
Q. Sir C. Gull; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 20*, 657.

Devonport Corporation Bill
l. Reported with Amendts., *July 26*, 1265.

Devonshire, Duke of—*Lord President of the Council*
Agricultural Holdings Bill, *Com.*, *July 27*, 1485.
Education Bill, 2R., *July 23*, 806, 825, 826, 827, 830, 831, 832.
Educational Grants—Differential Treatment in Rural and Urban Schools, *July 24*, 1034.
Reading Clerkship Vacancy, Appointment of Legal Assistant, etc., *July 24*, 1014.

Didsbury Voluntary School Rate
Q. Mr. C. Williams; *A.* Mr. Chaplin, *July 26*, 1317.

Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir C. [Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean]
Army
Medical Department—Omissions from Mr. Wyndham's Statement, *July 27*, 1539.
Reserve Stores, *July 27*, 1538.
Royal Reserve Battalions, Supply of Clothing, Arms, etc., *July 27*, 1539.
Supplementary Estimate—Mr. Wyndham's Statement, *July 27*, 1538.
Training the Army for War, *July 27*, 1548.
Workmen's Compensation Act, Extension to the Army of the Principles of the Act—Allowances to Widows, etc., *July 27*, 1540
China—Yang-tsze Cable, Financial Arrangement, etc., *July 17*, 219.
County Court Fees—Report of Committee, *July 27*, 1519.
Indian Army, Reduction of Guns in heavy Field Batteries, *July 24*, 1053.
Navy
Guns
Erosion of, by Cordite—Committee of Inquiry, *July 17*, 226.
Reserve of Guns, etc., *July 17*, 337.
Non-inflammable Wood, Use of, in the Construction of Ships, *July 17*, 247, 272.
Shipbuilding Programme
Danger to the Empire and Naval means of meeting the Danger, etc., *July 17*, 272.
Limiting Programme to Output in Armour and Machinery, *July 17*, 273.

Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir C.—*cont.*
Navy—*cont.*
Torpedo Boat Destroyers, Purchase of, *July 17*, 277.
Water-tube Boilers on Naval Ships, *July 17*, 271.
Picric Acid, Manufacture of in England—Sufficient Supply for the Army and Navy, *July 17*, 226, 336.
Rifle Clubs—Establishment of, as means of Defence, *July 17*, 272.
South African War
Censorship of Letters and Telegrams—Complaints, *July 27*, 1622.
Horses, Supply of Horses, etc., *July 27*, 1547.
Rolling Stock, *July 27*, 1541.
Surrender of British Prisoners, Guns, etc.—Inquiry, *July 27*, 1541.
Warren's, Sir C., Appointment, *July 27*, 1545.

Dillon, Mr. J. [Mayo, E.]
Academy, Royal Irish—Grant-in-aid for Salary of Irish Scribe and printing Manuscripts, etc., *July 19*, 479, 480.
Arms and Ammunition, Exportation of, to China by British Firms, *July 20*, 641.
Business of the House—Organised Counts-out, alleged Government abuse of the Time of the House, etc., *July 16*, 99.
China—Anti-Foreign Rising, etc.
Allied Forces—Officer in Command, *July 16*, 60, 61.
Despatch from the Emperor of China, *July 16*, 60.
Papers—Laying on the Table, *July 16*, 61.
Constabulary, Royal Irish—Appointment of Colonel N. Chamberlain as Inspector General, *July 16*, 85.
Gas Order Confirmation (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *July 17*, 212, 214.
Intermediate Education (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *July 19*, 502, 506, 507, 508, 513, 514.
Irish Convicts—Case of Muldowney and Finigan, Remission of Sentence, *July 20*, 665.
Irish Education Bill, 2R., *July 19*, 529.
Irish Language, Use of, in Irish Schools in place of English, *July 20*, 746.
"Killing Home Rule by Kindness," *July 16*, 174.
Loan Fund Board, Ireland—Report, *July 16*, 83.
Reformatory and Industrial Schools, Ireland — Chief Secretary's Circular, etc., *July 20*, 771.
Tithe Rent-charge (Ireland) Bill, 3R., *July 16*, 127, 163; *Re-com.*, 135, 141, 146.

Diocesan Records Bill
Bill Withdrawn, *July 19*, 584.
Opposition to
O. Mr. Leighton, *July 16*, 98.

Diocesan Registration Bill
l. Reported without Amendt., *July 17*, 192.
Reported with Amendts., *July 19*, 420.
3R.* *July 20*, 619.

Diplomatic and Consular Reports
see Trade Reports—(*for* Countries *see* their names).

Discharged Soldiers
see Soldiers.

Disfranchisement
South African Rebels, *see* South African War—Rebels.

District Councils
Dorking—Local Government Board supplying *Dorking Advertiser* with letter addressed to Rural District Council
Q. Mr. Cubitt; *A.* Mr. Chaplin, *July 16*, 73.
Tenants of Labourers' Cottages, Ireland—Disqualification, Test Case
Q. Sir W. Foster; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 26*, 1337.

District Messengers Company
Non-renewal of Licence
Q. Colonel Milward; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 23*, 873.
Royalty Paid to the Post Office
Q. Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 26*, 1327.

Docks
Accommodation for Naval Ships—New Works, etc.
Os. Viscount Sidmouth, Earl of Hopetoun, Earl Spencer, *July 17*, 207.

Dogs
Importation of into Great Britain, Regulations
Q. Mr. Channing; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 27*, 1512.
Muzzling Regulations in Cork
Q. Mr. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. Plunkett, *July 27*, 1522.

Dogs Regulation Bill
c. Bill Withdrawn, *July 16*, 187.

Domestic Servants
Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension Bill, *July 16*, 37, 39.

Domvile, Admiral
Manœuvres of 1899—Report on Belleville Boiler Ships
Q. Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *July 17*, 227.

Donegal Railway Bill
l. Commons Amendts.* *July 16*, 3.

Donelan, Capt. A. J. C. [Cork, E.]
Cahirciveen and Valentia—Erection of Perch or Buoy proposed, etc., *July 23*, 886.
Land Purchase under Ashbourne Act and Land Acts, 1892, 1896—Terms of Purchase, Sinking Fund, etc., *July 24*, 1061.
National Teachers—Arrears of Fee Grant, *July 27*, 1523.
Poor Law Schools—National Teachers' Interests, *July 26*, 1342.
Roman Catholic Chaplains in the Navy, *July 27*, 1510.
South African Blue-books—Publication of Newspaper Correspondence, *July 20*, 645, 646.
South African War—Cost and Finance of the War, Contribution by Ireland towards Gross Cost, *July 23*, 856, 857.
Workhouses, Dietary Regulations, *July 24*, 1059.

Doogan, Mr. P. C. [Tyrone, E.]
Coagh Postal Service—Defects, etc., *July 26*, 1333.
Rossavalley Tenantry—Payment of Interest in lieu of Rent to Land Commission, *July 26*, 1336.

Dorington, Sir J. [Gloucester, Tewkesbury]
Militia — Furlough Pay of Embodied Militiamen, *July 17*, 225.

Dorking
Local Government Board supplying *Dorking Advertiser* with letter addressed to Rural District Council
Q. Mr. Cubitt ; *A.* Mr. Chaplin, *July 16*, 73.

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. A.—*First Commissioner of Works* [Kent, St. Augustine's]
Dogs — Importation into Great Britain, Regulations, *July 27*, 1512.
Duke of York's School — Condition of Laundry, etc., *July 26*, 1310.
Foot and Mouth Disease Regulations—Norfolk County Council Resolution, *July 16*, 77.
House of Commons
Accommodation for Members, *July 26*, 1324.
Committee Rooms, Outside Blinds, Ventilation, etc., *July 26*, 1325.
Irish Cattle, landing at Port of London, *July 16*, 81.
Kensington Gardens, Opening and Closing Regulations, *July 27*, 1513.
Palace of Westminster, Works Department—Employees' Holiday Grievance, *July 16*, 76.
Piccadilly, Widening—Obtaining Strip of Green Park, etc., *July 24*, 1059.

Drage, Mr. G. [Derby]
Ashanti Rising—Relief of Coomassie, *July 17*, 230.

Dromore River Floods
Complaints addressed to the Board of Works and Lough Erne Drainage Board
Q. Mr. Daly ; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 26*, 1331.

Drumconrath
Postal Arrangements
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 26*, 1335.

"Dry Bobs" of Military Defence
Os. Earl of Wemyss, *July 27*, 1461 ; Earl of Rosebery, 1471.

Dublin
Botanical Gardens—Expenditure since 1890
Q. Mr. T. M. Healy ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 19*, 477.
Land Commission and the Ulster Custom—Lindsay *v.* Corry
Q. Mr. S. Young ; *A* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 17*, 237.
Metropolitan Police—Batons and Handcuffs—Place of Manufacture, Cost, etc.
Q. Mr. T. M. Healy ; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 23*, 878.
National Gallery—Report, *July 25*, 1162 ; *July 26*, 1168.
Phœnix Park
Grazing Rents, Annual Receipts from—Cattle Nuisance, etc.
Q. Mr. T. M. Healy ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 19*, 475.
Ornamental Trees and Shrubs—Planting trees similar to those in London Parks
Q. Mr. T. M. Healy ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 20*, 669.
Ornamental Waters, laying out similar to Hyde Park, etc.
Q. Mr. T. M. Healy ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 20*, 668
Post Office—Sorting Staff Grievances
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July* 26, 1332.
Rates, Equalisation of, etc.—Legislation proposed, Recommendation of Joint Committee on Dublin Corporation Bill
Q. Mr. T. M. Healy ; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 23*, 886.
Water Gas, Use of—Recommendations of Departmental Committee, etc.
Q. Mr. T. M. Healy ; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *July 20*, 654.

Dublin Corporation Bill
c. Con. and 3R.* *July 26*, 1290.
l. 1R.* *July 26*, 1267.
Report from Joint Committee, *July 20*, 588, 637.

Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway Bill
c. Reported with Amendts., *July 17*, 216.
*Con.** *July 23*, 84[illegible].
3R.* *July 26*, 1295.
l. Commons Amendts.* *July 27*, 1456.

Duckworth, Mr. J. [Lancashire, Middleton]
Postage—Excess Charge on unstamped Letters, etc., *July 23*, 871.

Duke of York's School
Condition of Laundry, etc.
Q. Dr. Farquharson; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 26*, 1309.

Dukinfield Postmastership
Number of Applicants, etc.
Q. Mr. M'Ghee; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 17*, 233.

Dungannon
Gas Order Confirmation (No. 2) Bill, *see* that title.

Dungloe Petty Sessions
Truck Act Prosecution—Case of Mr. O'Donnell
Q. Mr. T. D. Sullivan; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *July 23*, 882.

Durham (County of) Electric Power Supply Bill
c. Con. and 3R.* *July 16*, 40.
l. 1R.* *July 16*, 3.
2R.* *July 20*, 586.
Committed, *July 23*, 786.
Report from Committee of Selection, *July 23*, 788; *July 24*, 987.
Report from Select Committee, *July 26*, 1265.
Standing Orders, *July 19*, 409.

East Ham Corporation Bill
l. Report from Committee of Selection, *July 16*, 3.

East India
see India.

East Indian Railway
Purchase of, by Indian Government—Rate of Interest in settling Annuities
Q. Mr. Gordon; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *July 23*, 865.

East London Water Bill
l. Report from Committee of Selection, *July 16*, 3; *July 17*, 191.
Report from Select Committee, *July 20*, 585.
3R.* *July 24*, 986.

Eastern Bengal and Scinde Railway
Purchase of, by Indian Government—Rate of Interest in Settling Annuities
Q. Mr. Gordon; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *July 23*, 865; *Q.* Mr. A. H. A. Morton; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *July 26*, 1314.

Edinburgh Corporation Bill
*c. Con.** *July 17*, 215.
3R.* *July 20*, 636.
l. Commons Amendts.* *July 23*, 787.

Edinburgh (Housing of the Working Classes) Improvement Scheme Provisional Order Bill
c. 2R.* *July 16*, 54.
Reported without Amendts., and 3R.* *July 20*, 637.
l. 1R.* *July 20*, 587.
2R.* *July 26*, 1268.
*Com.** and *Rep.** *July 27*, 1457.
Standing Orders, *July 19*, 450; *July 23*, 785.

Education
Vice-President of the Council — Rt. Hon. Sir J. E. Gorst.
Attendance at School
Bye-laws Exempting Children Employed in Agriculture
Q. Mr. Jeffreys; *A.* Sir J. Gorst, *July 23*, 868.
Registration of—Duplicate Registration of Science and Art Scholars
Q. Mr. E. Cecil; *A.* Sir J. Gorst, *July 24*, 1057.
Block Grant System—Differential Treatment in Rural and Urban Schools
Debate (Lords), *July 24*, 1024.
Code of 1900—Result, etc.
Debate (Lords), *July 24*, 1024.
Consultative Committee, Composition and Functions of—Non-representation of Scientific, Technical, and Commercial Industries, etc.
Q. Mr. Mather; *A.* Sir J. Gorst, *July 23*, 869.
Evening Continuation Schools—Petition, *July 27*, 1497.
Geological Survey Maps, Limited Sale of, etc.
Q. Mr. Hazell; *A.* Sir J. Gorst, *July 23*, 869.
Grants
Differential Treatment in Rural and Urban Schools
Motion (Lord Heneage), *July 24*, 1024.
Scotch Questions, *see* that subheading.
Voluntary Schools Act and Elementary Education Act, 1897—Total Amount of Grants
Q. Mr. Caldwell; *A.* Sir J. Gorst, *July 20*, 658.
Holyhead National Schools, *see* Holyhead.
Irish Questions
Irish Language, Use of in Irish Schools in Place of English, *see* Irish Language
Intermediate Education
Annual Report — Including Names of Superintendents of Examinations, suggested
Q. Mr. Flynn; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 20*, 664.

Education—*cont.*

Irish Questions—*cont.*

Intermediate Education—*cont.*

Education Board Clerks
Q. Mr. T. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 27*, 1524.

Intermediate Education Bill, *see* that title.

Monitors, Instruction of by National Teachers—Gratuities, Results of Easter Examination, etc.
Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 19*, 483; *Q.* Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 20*, 664.

National Education—Annual Report and Appendices Presented, *July 26*, 1297; *July 27*, 1458.

National School Teachers, *see* that title.

New Scheme of Primary Education
Opportunity for Discussion
Os. Mr. J. Redmond, Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 20*, 767, 769.

Teachers' Association Memorial
Q. Mr. Flynn; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 19*, 482.

Vote for National Education, *July 20*, 673.

London School Board

Application for Recognition as Higher Elementry Schools, etc.
Q. Mr. Lough; *A.* Sir J. Gorst, *July 27*, 1516.

Audit Case—Delay in Submitting to Queen's Bench
Q. Mr. E. Cecil; *A.* Sir J. Gorst, *July 23*, 870.

Pauper Children, *see* that title.

Science and Art Directory, *see* that title.

Science and Art Regulations—New Regulations
Qs. Mr. Harwood, Mr. J. Pease; *As.* Sir J. Gorst, *July 27*, 1515.

Scotch Questions

Education Act, 1897 — Imperial Grants
Q. Mr. Caldwell; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *July 20*, 658.

Fee Grant—Annual Payments on basis of Equivalent Grants, etc.
Q. Mr. Caldwell; *A.* Sir M. H. Beach, *July 17*, 236.

Universities Fees—Return
Q. Mr. T. Shaw; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *July 20*, 659.

Special Aid Grant — Differential Treatment in Rural and Urban Schools
Debate (Lords), *July 24*, 1024.

Teachers Superannuation Act, Extending to Channel Islands and Isle of Man
Q. Mr. Yoxall; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *July 16*, 71.

(*see also* titles of Bills.)

Education—*cont.*

Technical Education

Committees—Women Members, Return Presented, *July 20*, 639.

Minutes of Board of Education sanctioning Subjects to be taught under Clause 8 Presented, *July 16*, 8, 56; *July 20*, 588, 639.

Wimbledon—Proposed School Board, etc.
Q. Mr. Price; *A.* Sir J. Gorst, *July 24*, 1055.

Education Bill

l. 2R., *July 23*, 796.

Education Bill

Debate on Second Reading, *July 23*, 796.

Assistant Secretaries, 800.

Classical Education, German Emperor on—"I don't want Romans and Greeks; I want Germans," 816.

Classics *v.* Modern Literature, 815.

Denominational Training Colleges, 810, 832.

Education Board Reports of 1897 and 1899, 808, 814.

Education Department—Reorganisation, Powers, Constitution of the Board, etc., 799, 824, 829.

Elementary, distinguished from Secondary Education, 797, 803, 807, 812, 819.

Free Education, Disadvantages, etc., 797, 799, 827.

Funds for Educational Purposes, 797, 802, 820, 827.

Grammar Schools, Re-organising, etc., 806, 824.

Higher Elementary Schools—Suitability of Instruction to the Circumstances of the Scholars and the Neighbourhood, 813.

Local Authorities, Powers and Duties, Constitution of Education Committees, Schemes, etc., 797, 803, 806, 809, 818, 820, 823, 828.

Appeal — Decision of Disputes between Local Authorities and the Education Board, 824, 830.

Endowments, 819, 824, 828.

Grants-in-aid, Representation on Committees of assisted Schools, 804, 818, 822, 834.

Inquiries into the Needs of every District suggested, 817, 819, 829.

Merging of Technical Instruction into Secondary Education, 797, 808, 815.

Parliamentary Control over Local Education Committees' Schemes, etc., 799, 803, 809, 824, 830.

Private Schools, Denominational Schools, etc.—Grants-in-aid, 805, 821, 824, 831.

Education Bill—*cont.*
Debate on Second Reading—*cont.*
Prussian State System of Education, 798, 799.
Religious Instruction in Schools—Boarding and Day Schools, Conscience Clause — Cowper - Temple Clause, etc., 805, 809, 825, 831.
Royal Commission on Secondary Education Report, 818, 819, 828.
Schools, Establishing by Local Authorities, 811.
Science Schools — Necessity for Schools of General Education rather than Schools of Science, 813.
Voluntary Schools, 804.
Welsh Intermediate Education Act, 825.

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill
c. Committed, *July 16*, 41.
Reported with Amendts., *July 23*, 846.
Con. July 24*, 1038.
3R.* *July 25*, 1161.
l. Commons Amendts.* *July 26*, 1267.
Standing Orders, *July 18*, 341.

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill
Debate on Motion to Commit Bill to Select Committee, *July 16*, 41.
Accomodation per Child, Standard of, etc., 42, 44, 47.
Belvedere Place Board School, Southwark, Alterations, etc., 49, 51, 52.
Discrepancy between Figures supplied by Board of Education and those supplied by School Board, 43, 44.
Housing of the Working Classes, 49, 51.
Inquiries—Parliamentary and Local Inquiries, 45, 46, 48, 51, 52.
School Board, Powers of, etc., 42, 44, 47.
Sites, Selection, etc., 42, 45, 46, 49, 51, 52.
Voluntary Schools, Petitions, etc., 42, 44.

Education (Scotland) Bill
Bill Withdrawn, *July 16*, 187.
Petitions, *July 17*, 216; *July 18*, 342; *July 20*, 639; *July 27*, 1497.

Egerton, Earl
Merchant Shipping (Liability of Shipowners and others) Bill, 3R., *July 26*, 1270.

Eggs
Russian Eggs, Importation to Ireland—Exportation to England as Irish Eggs
Qs. Mr. Field, Mr. P. O'Brien; *As.* Mr. Plunkett, *July 20*, 670.

Electioneering Speeches in the House
Attack on Mr. Chamberlain by Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 25*, 1201.

Electrical Conductors
Potato Crop Experiments
Q. Mr. Austin; *A.* Mr. Plunkett, *July 26*, 1340.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill
c. Reported without Amendt., *July 17*, 215.
3R.* *July 18*. 341.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill
*l. Com.** and *Rep.* July 16*, 5.
3R.* *July 17*, 191.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill
l. Report from Committee of Selection, *July 16*, 3; *July 17*, 191.
Report from Select Committee, *July 26*, 1265.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill
l. Reported with Amendts., *July 16*, 5.
3R.* *July 17*, 191.
Com. July 27*, 1457.
c. Lords Amendts.* *July 20*, 637.

Elementary Education Act, 1897
Imperial Grant—Total Amount for 1899
Q. Mr. Caldwell; *A.* Sir J. Gorst, *July 20*, 658.

Elementary Education Bill
c. Reported without Amendt., *July 20*, 672.

Elementary School Teachers' Superannuation (Isle of Man) Bill
c. 1R.* *July 19*, 487.
2R., *July 26*, 1447.

Elementary School Teachers' Superannuation (Jersey) Bill
c. 1R.* *July 19*, 487.
2R.* *July 26*, 1448.

Elliot Mr. A. R. D. [Durham]
South African War—Treatment of Rebels, Settlement after the War, etc., *July 25*, 1175.

Emmott, Mr. A. [Oldham]
Indian Budget—Famine, Imperial Grant, etc., *July 26*, 1424.

Employers' Liability
Proceedings under Act—Statistics Presented, *July 26*, 1269, 1297.
(*see also* Workmen's Compensation.)

Engineer Corps
Volunteer Corps for South-East Lancashire
Q. Sir J. W. Maclure ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 20*, 649 ; *July 26*, 1305.

English Church Union
Ritualism in the Church
Os. Earl of Portsmouth, *July 16*, 16 ; Marquess of Salisbury, 27.

Enlistment
see Army.

Enniskillen Workhouse
Weir, Private, *see* that title.

Enteric Fever
see South African War.

Equalisation of Rates Act
Accounts under Section I., etc.—Return Ordered, *July 26*, 1298.

Equalisation of Rates, Dublin
Legislation
Q. Mr. T. M. Healy ; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 23*, 886.

Erne, Earl of
Tithe Rent-charge (Ireland) Bill, *Rep.*, *July 26*, 1281.

Erzeroum
Trade Report Presented, *July 17*, 192.

Esmonde, Sir T. G. [Kerry, W.]
Civil Service Abstractors—Terms of Service, *July 27*, 1519.
Irish Language, Use of in Irish Schools in place of English, *July 20*, 716.
Reformatory and Industrial Schools, Ireland, *July 20*, 779.

Eton
Army Commissions, Number allotted to Eton—Direct Commissions, etc.
Q. Major Rasch ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 24*, 1048.

"Europa," H.M.S.
Manœuvres of 1899—Defects, Speed, etc.—Admiral Domvile's Report and the Statement in the Memorandum
Q. Mr. G. Bowles ; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *July 17*, 227.

Evans, Sir F. H. [Southampton]
Kent Artillery Volunteers—Easter Camp Allowances, *July 20*, 648.

Evening Continuation Schools
Petition, *July 27*, 1497.

Evictions, Ireland
Notices—Return Presented, *July 19*, 414, 453.

Executors (Scotland) Bill
l. 2R., *July 20*, 618.
Com. July 24*, 1010.

Exeter Corporation Bill
l. Reported with Amendts., *July 20*, 586
3R.* *July 27*, 1450.

Exmouth Urban District Water Bill
l. Commons Amendts.* *July 20*, 585.

Expenditure in India
see India—Finance.

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill
c. Intro. and 1R.* *July 23*, 889.

Exportation of Arms
see Arms and Ammunition.

Exportation of Coal
see Coal.

Faber, Mr. G. D. [York]
Ammunition—Small Arms Ammunition Supplies, *July 24*, 1046.

Factories and Workshops Bill
Bill Withdrawn, *July 16*, 187.

Factory and Workshop (1878) Amendment (No. 2) Bill
Bill Withdrawn, *July 18*, 344.

Falkirk and District Water Bill
c. 3R.* *July 16*, 53.
l. Commons Amendts.* *July 17*, 190 ; *July 19*, 411.

Famine
see India.

Fardell, Sir T. G. [Paddington, S.]
Fire Brigades Committee Report—Publication of in *The Times* previous to Laying on the Table, *July 20*, 654.
Sheringham—Delay in delivery of Letters *July 23*, 870, 871.
Surveyors, Ireland—Non-appointment of Mr. Carden, Successful Candidate for Assistant Surveyorship of Buildings, *July 19*, 475.

Farnworth Urban District Council Bill
l. Reported with Amendts., *July 24*, 985.

Farquhar, Lord
County and Borough Franchise Assimilation (London) Bill, 2R., *July 17*, 193.

Farquharson, Dr. [Aberdeenshire, W.]
Agricultural Holdings Bill, 3R., *July 19*, 537.

Farquharson, Dr.—*cont.*
Army Medical Department
Civil Surgeons, supposed Pledge of Secrecy, *July 20*, 643; *July 26*, 1301.
Male Nurses, Medical Officers, etc., *July 27*, 1581.
Duke of York's School—Condition of Laundry, etc., *July 26*, 1309.

Fee Grant
see Scotland.

Feeble-minded Paupers
see Paupers.

Fergusson, Rt. Hon. Sir J. [Manchester, N.E.]
Army Medical Department—Lessons of the South African War, etc., *July 27*, 1579.
South African War
Imperial Yeomanry Encampment near Beira, *July 27*, 1504.
Inquiry into Blunders, etc., *July 27*, 1578.

Fermanagh
Rossavalley Tenantry—Payment of Purchase Money to Land Commission
Q. Mr. Doogan; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 26*, 1336.

Feversham, Earl of
Agricultural Holdings Bill, *Com.*, *July 27*, 1493.

Field, Admiral [Sussex, Eastbourne]
Navy
Cordite Explosion on the "Revenge," Armour-piercing Projectiles, etc., *July 17*, 338; *July 26*, 1310.
First Sea Lord's Official Residence, *July 17*, 339; *July 26*, 1310.
Shipbuilding Programme—Arrears in Shipbuilding, Foreign Contracts Executed in England, etc., *July 17*, 262.
Water-tube Boilers, *July 17*, 291.

Field, Mr. W. [Dublin, St. Patrick]
Eggs—Russian Eggs Imported to Ireland—Exportation to England as Irish Eggs, *July 20*, 670.
Intermediate Education (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *July 19*, 520.
Irish Language, Use of, in Irish Schools in place of English, *July 20*, 738.
Monitors' Easter Examinations—Delay in Publishing Results, *July 20*, 664.
Tuberculosis—Case of, on West Cheshire Farm, *July 24*, 1054.
Warble Fly Causing Injuries to Cattle—Precautions against, *July 20*, 670.

Finance of India
see India.

Financial Relations, England and India
see India—Finance, Expenditure Commission, etc.

Financial Relations, England and Ireland
South African War Expenditure—Amount Contributed by Ireland
Q. Capt. Donelan; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 23*, 856; *O.* Mr. T. M. Healy, *July 27*, 1637.

Finigan, Irish Convict
Remission of Sentence, proposed
Qs. Mr. J. Roche, Mr. Dillon, Mr. S. MacNeill; *As.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 20*, 664.

Finlay, Sir R. B.—*Attorney-General* [Inverness Burghs]
Agricultural Holdings Bill, 3R., *July 19*, 575.
Bail Regulations—Detention of Persons awaiting Trial, *July 23*, 876.
Companies Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1074, 1092, 1097, 1102, 1104, 1105, 1117, 1118, 1119, 1120, 1133, 1148.
County Courts (Investment of Deposits) Bill, *Con.*, *July 19*, 583.
Food Preservatives Departmental Committee—Adjournment of Legal Proceedings until the Report is Presented, *July 27*, 1517.
Imitation of County Court Process Bill, 2R., *July 23*, 976.
Land Revenue Records—Rules Regulating Inspection by the Public, *July 26*, 1324.
Naval Reserve Bill, *Com.*, *July 26*, 1447.

Firbank, Mr. J. T. [Hull, E.]
Coal Supply—Reserve for Naval Purposes, Exportation of Coal to Foreign Countries, *July 26*, 1313.

Fire Brigades Committee
Report — Publication of in *The Times*, previous to laying on the Table
Q. Sir G. Fardell; *A.* Mr. J. Collings, *July 20*, 654.
Report Presented, *July 16*, 92.

First Commissioner of Works
Rt. Hon. A. A. Douglas.

First Lord of the Admiralty
Rt. Hon. G. J. Goschen.

First Lord of the Treasury
Rt. Hon. A. J. Balfour.

First Sea Lord's Residence
see Admiralty—Residence.

Fish Culture
Marine Biological Association, *see* that title.

Fisheries
Great Yarmouth Fisherman and the Militia
Q. Sir J. Colomb; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 27*, 1507.

Fisheries—*cont.*
Ireland
Arklow Drift-net Fishing — Fishermen's Petition for Removal of Restrictions
Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Plunkett, *July 23*, 885.
Inspector's Report Shannon Water and Electric Power Bill
Q. Earl of Mayo; *A.* Earl of Denbigh, *July 23*, 841.
Trawlers, Protection against—Naval Gun Boats, etc.
Q. Mr. Power; *A.* Mr. Plunkett, *July 23*, 885.
West Clare Fishing Industry, Development of—Proposed Grant
Q. Major Jameson; *A.* Mr. Plunkett, *July 24*, 1063.
St. Petersburg Herring Trade—Facilities for discharge and storage
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *July 16*, 71.

Fishery Harbours
see Piers and Harbours

Fishguard and Rosslare Railways
Construction of line between Cork and Fermoy—Carrying out Company's Undertaking, etc.
Q. Mr. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 26*, 1338.

Flannery, Sir F. [Yorkshire, Shipley]
Navy
Admiralty Staff, Increase in, *July 17*, 270.
Expenditure on Shipbuilding, Supply of Armour, Machinery — Messrs. Armstrong, Whitworth and Co.'s Offer, etc., *July 17*, 263.
Water-tube Boilers, *July 17*, 248, 266.
Manœuvres of 1899—"Argonaut," H.M.S., Repairs, etc., *July 17*, 228.

Flavin, Mr. M. J. [Kerry, N.]
Constabulary, Royal Irish
Appointment of Col. N. Chamberlain as Inspector General, *July 16*, 85; *July 17*, 238, 239.
Sands', J., Farm near Listowel, Protection of, etc., *July 19*, 478, 479.
Sneem—Extra Police Force, Protection of Mr. Warden's House, etc., *July 19*, 481, 482.
Cork Assizes—Case of Edmond Carmody, *July 16*, 85.
Greeveguilla—Daily Delivery of Letters proposed, *July 16*, 80.
Irish Language, Use of in Irish Schools in Place of English, *July 20*, 763.
Listowel - Ballybunion Railway—Cost, *July 16*, 80.
Listowel to Tarbert Railway—Receiving Deputation with a view to giving grant, *July 19*, 478.

Flavin, Mr. M. J.—*cont.*
Sneem
National Teacher's Residence Site, *July 20*, 662.
Pier, Erection of Goods Store, Mr. Warden's Objections, *July 20*, 669.
Surveyors—County and Assistant County Surveyors devoting whole time to their Duties—Pensions, etc., *July 19*, 483.
Under-age Recruits—Case of Private Walsh, *July 19*, 458.

Fletcher, Sir H. [Sussex, Lewes]
Hove Recreation Ground—Raising Loan, *July 27*, 1514.
Volunteers Bill, 2R., *July 18*, 368, 383.

Florins
Coinage of Double Florins, Discontinuance of
Q. Mr. W. F. D. Smith; *A.* Sir M. H. Beach, *July 19*, 469.

Flower, Mr. E. [Bradford, W.]
Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill—Select Com., *July 16*, 44, 51.
Feeble-minded Paupers, Number and Condition of—Inquiry proposed, *July 24*, 1053.
Pauper Children
Receiving Home, Establishment of at Lambeth—Local Government Board suggestion, *July 24*, 1053.
Wandsworth Board of Guardians—Offer of free Pardon to Parents reclaiming deserted Children, *July 24*, 1054.

Flynn, Mr. J. C. [Cork, N.]
Camden Fort Gun Fatality, *July 20*, 647; *July 26*, 1304; *July 27*, 1507.
Constabulary, Royal Irish
Appointment of Col. N. Chamberlain as Inspector General, *July 17*, 239.
Sneem Extra Police Force—Protection of Mr. Warden's House, etc., *July 19*, 482.
Cork Assizes—Trial of Cadogan, Selection of Jurymen, *July 23*, 884.
Education, Ireland—Intermediate Education Annual Report, *July 20*, 664.
Intermediate Education (Ireland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 26*, 1441.
Irish Education Bill, 2R., *July 19*, 529.
National School Teachers, Ireland—New Rules, Memorandum from Teachers' Association, etc., *July 19*, 482
Tithe Rent-charge (Ireland) Bill, 3R., *July 16*, 122, 178; *Re-com.*, *July 16*, 135, 137, 139, 140, 145.

Food Preservatives
Departmental Committee
Postponement of Legal Proceedings until the Report is Presented
Q. Mr. Lambert; *A.* Sir R. Finlay, *July 27*, 1517.

Food Preservatives—*cont.*
Departmental Committee—*cont.*
Report, Date of Issue
Qs. Mr. Lambert, Mr. T. M. Healy; *As.* Mr. Chaplin, *July 26*, 1316.

Foot and Mouth Disease
Norfolk—Resolution of County Council
Q. Mr. Soames; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 16*, 76.

Foreign Office
Secretary of State—Marquess of Salisbury.
Under Secretary—Rt. Hon. St. John Brodrick.

"Foreign Origin"
Imported Decorated Tin Boxes and the Merchandise Marks Act
Q. Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 27*, 1518.

Foreshores, Ireland
Removal of Gravel from Greystones
Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 16*, 79.

Foster, Mr. H. S. [Suffolk, Lowestoft]
Companies Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1071, 1073, 1104, 1106, 1107, 1126, 1127, 1130, 1132, 1153, 1159.
South African War—Gifts for the Troops, Failure in Delivering, *July 26*, 1302.

Foster, Sir W. [Derby, Ilkeston]
Companies Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1066.
Irish Tenancy Contracts—Disqualification of Members of District Councils, etc., *July 26*, 1337.
South African War
Enteric Fever at Ladysmith, *July 16*, 65.
Hospital, Sanitary and Medical Arrangements, *July 27*, 1564.
Inquiry
Additional Member, *July 16*, 62.
Inquiry into Sanitary Arrangements, *July 27*, 1499.

Fowler, Sir H. H. [Wolverhampton, E.]
China—Anti-Foreign Rising, etc.—Tientsin, Reported Attacks by Allied Forces, *July 17*, 218.
Historical Manuscripts Commission, Restricting operations to Manuscripts belonging to Private Persons, etc., *July 17*, 234.
Indian Budget, *July 26*, 1367—(*for* details, *see* their titles under India).
Volunteers Bill, 2R., *July 18*, 385.

France
Coal, Increase in Exports from England
Q. Mr. Harwood; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 26*, 1313.

France—*cont.*
Madagascar—French Import Duties, Increase of—Infraction of British Trade Rights, Reply to Representations, etc.
Q. Mr. D. A. Thomas; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *July 19*, 463.
Submarine Boats, Trials of
Q. Mr. Harwood; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *July 26*, 1310.

Franchise
County and Borough Franchise, etc., Bill, *see* that title.

Frankfort De Montmorency, Viscount
Australia Reserve Forces, Proposed Enrolment of Colonial Naval Reserve, etc., *July 19*, 439.

Frankfort-on-Main
Trade Report Presented, *July 24*, 988.

Fraser Settled Chattels Bill
l. 3R.* *July 16*, 2.
c. 1R.* *July 16*, 55.
2R.* *July 25*, 1161.
Standing Orders, *July 20*, 636.

Freeholders
County and Borough Franchise Assimilation (London) Bill, *July 17*, 194, 195.

French, Sergeant G.
Death of, at Bloemfontein—Delay in notifying to Relations
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 16*, 66.

French's, Gen., Proposals
Colonial Naval Reserve
Os. Viscount Frankfort, *July 19*, 439; Marquess of Lansdowne, 443, 444, 445.

Furlough and Pay
see Militia.

Galloway, Mr. W. J. [Manchester, S.W.]
Business of the House—Companies Bill, etc., *July 16*, 107.
Durham (County of) Electric Power Supply Bill, *Con.*, *July 16*, 40.
Patriotic Commissioners—Transvaal War Fund, Government Proposals, etc., *July 16*, 107.

Gas
Water Gas, Use of—Recommendations of Departmental Committee, etc.
Qs. Mr. J. W. Wilson, Mr. T. M. Healy; *As.* Mr. Ritchie, *July 20*, 653.

Gas Light and Coke, Commercial Gas and South Metropolitan Gas Companies Bill
l. Reported with Amendts., *July 26*, 1266.

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill
c. 3R.* *July 16*, 54.
l. Commons Amendts.* *July 17*, 190; *July 20*, 587.

Gas Order Confirmation (No. 2) Bill
c. 2R., *July 17*, 211.

Gas Order Confirmation (No. 2) Bill
Debate on Second Reading, *July 17*, 211.
Board of Trade Inquiry, 214.
Capital, Dividends, etc., 212.
Local Authority, Powers of—Breaking up Streets, etc., 213, 214.
Price of Gas, 212, 213.
Purchase of Gas Company's Undertakings by Town Commissioners, Price, etc., 212.

Gas Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill
c. Lords Amendts.* *July 16*, 54.

Gedge, Mr. S. [Walsall]
Companies Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1073, 1074, 1083, 1108, 1113, 1129, 1130, 1151, 1154, 1155, 1159.

General Election
Electioneering Speeches in the House
Lloyd-George's, Mr., Attack on Mr. Chamberlain, *July 25*, 1201.

Geological Survey
Maps, Limited Sale of—Coloured Six-inch Maps, Publishing at lower price, proposed
Q. Mr. Hazell; *A.* Sir J. Gorst, *July 23*, 869.

German Emperor
"Mailed Fist" Speech
O. Mr. J. Burns, *July 23*, 947.

Germany
Commercial Treaty with Great Britain—Exclusion of Canada from Most-favoured Nation Treatment
Q. Gen. Laurie; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 26*, 1343.

Gibraltar
Dock Accommodation for Naval Ships—New Works
Os. Viscount Sidmouth, Earl of Hopetoun, Earl Spencer, *July 17*, 207.
Garrison—Officers' Houses
Q. Mr. Pierpoint; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 27*, 1506.

Giles, Mr. C. T. [Cambridge, Wisbech]
Agricultural Holdings Bill, 3R., *July 19*, 548.

Gillingham, Mr.
Pretoria Magazine, Attempt to blow up—Sentence of Death
Qs. Mr. P. O'Brien; *As* Mr. Wyndham, *July 17*, 224; *July 24*, 1043.

Glasgow Building Regulations Bill
*c. Con.** and 3R.* *July 24*, 1038.
l. Commons Amendts.* *July 26*, 1267.

Glasgow District Tramways Bill
c. Reported, *July 20*, 637.
Re-committed, *July 26*, 1296.
Minutes of Evidence referred to Committee on Group 8 of Railway Bills, *July 18*, 342.

Glass Industry
Belgium—Report Presented, *July 17*, 192.

Glebe Loans Acts
Profit accruing to the Treasury—Relaxation of Terms of Loans to Borrowers, proposed
Q. Mr. M'Ghee; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 16*, 84.

Glenarm and Larne
Coast Road, Use of Traction Engines on—Cost of Maintenance
Q. Mr. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 19*, 476.

Glyncorrwg Urban District Council Gas Bill
*c. Con.** *July 16*, 53.
3R.* *July 19*, 450.
l. Commons Amendts.* *July 20*, 586; *July 27*, 1449.

Goddard, Mr. D. F. [Ipswich]
Harwich Post Office Staff—Transferring Female Telegraphists to Enfield, etc., *July 20*, 657.
Rifle Clubs, Formation of—Government Allowances, *July 20*, 648.

Gold Standard
India, Result
O. Lord G. Hamilton, *July 26*, 1361.
Effect of on Trade
O. Sir H. Fowler, *July 26*, 1367.

Goldsworthy, Gen. W. T. [Hammersmith]
Volunteers Bill, 2R., *July 18*, 376.

Gordon, Mr. J. E. [Elgin and Nairn]
Indian Railways, Purchase of, by Indian Government
Contracts — Policy in determining future Contracts, *July 23*, 867.
Rate of Interest in Settling Annuities, etc., *July 23*, 865, 866.

Gorst Rt. Hon. Sir J. E.—*Vice-President of Council for Education* [Cambridge University]
Attendance at School
Bye-laws Exempting Children Employed in Agriculture, *July 23*, 868.
Registration of, Duplicate Registration—Science and Art Instruction in London Board Schools, *July 24*, 1057.
Consultative Committee, Composition and Functions of, *July 23*, 869.
Educational Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill, Select Com., *July 16*, 46, 48, 52.

Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir J. E.—*cont.*
Geological Survey Maps, Limited Sale of, etc., *July 23*, 870.
Grants — Voluntary Schools Act and Elementary Education Act, 1897—Total Amount for 1899, *July 20*, 658.
Holyhead National School Teachers—Compelling Nonconformist Teachers to attend Church of England Services—Pupil Teachers' Salaries, etc., *July 24*, 1056, 1057.
London School Board
Application for Recognition as Higher Elementary Schools, etc., *July 27*, 1517.
Audit Case—Delay in Submitting to Queen's Bench, *July 23*, 870.
Pauper Children—Boarding out, Regulation against boarding out defective and epileptic children in same home with Pauper Children, *July 17*, 236.
Science and Art Directory—New Regulations, *July 27*, 1515, 1516.
Victoria and Albert Museum—Examination for Assistantships, *July 17*, 236.
Wimbledon—Proposed School Board, *July 24*, 1055.

Goschen, Rt. Hon. G. J.—*First Lord of the Admiralty* [St. George's, Hanover Square]
Boilers—Water-tube Boilers
Committee of Inquiry, Constitution of, *July 26*, 1311; *July 27*, 1510.
Statement, *July 17*, 247—Replies to Criticism, 281, 282, 289, 319, 332.
Manœuvres of 1899—Behaviour of Belleville Boiler Ships, Admiral Domvile's Report, etc., *July 17*, 228.
Channel Fleet—Visit to Invergordon proposed, *July 23*, 862.
Chaplains—Roman Catholic Chaplains, *July 27*, 1510.
China
Anti-Foreign Rising—British Marine Guard at Peking—Names of Officers and Men, *July 23*, 853.
Gun Boats for Protection of British Traders on Inland Waterways, *July 17*, 335.
Cordite—Explosion on H.M.S. "Revenge," *July 26*, 1310.
Courts-martial—Application of Criminal Evidence Act, *July 24*, 1049.
Estimates—Statement, *July 17*, 241—(*for* details, *see* Navy).
First Sea Lord—Official Residence, *July 26*, 1311.
French Submarine Boats, Trials of, *July 26*, 1310.
Guns—Reserve of Guns, etc., *July 17*, 338.
Jersey—Foreign Men-of-war manœuvring in and out of Harbours, *July 23*, 863.

Goschen, Rt. Hon. G. J.—*cont.*
Marine Officers—Hot Weather Uniforms on Board Ship and Ashore, *July 23*, 864.
Mediterranean and Channel Fleet, Nature and Extent of Cruises, etc.—Admiral's Reports, *July 24*, 1049.
Mersey, Placing Port Guardship in proposed—Recruiting at Liverpool, etc., *July 24*, 1050.
Naval Reserve Bill, 2R., *July 23*, 966, 967, 969; *Com.*, *July 26*, 1445.
Non-inflammable Wood, Use of, in the construction of ships, *July 16*, 68; *July 17*, 247.
Senior Naval Lord—Official Residence in the Vicinity of the Admiralty, *July 20*, 650; *July 26*, 1311.
Shah of Persia's Visit—Suggested Naval Review, *July 26*, 1312.
Shipbuilding—Delay in delivery of Ships, Armstrong, Whitworth and Co.'s Offer, etc., *July 17*, 263, 264.
South African War—Transport Officers, Rewards and Distinctions, *July 23*, 857.
Torpedo Boats at the Naval Manœuvres—Statistics, *July 27*, 1511.
Training of Officers, Amount of Sea Service, etc., *July 17*, 340; *July 24*, 1049.
Training Squadron
Officers in Charge of Dismantled Sailing Ships, etc., *July 23*, 862.
Re-commissioning Masted Training Squadron, etc., *July 26*, 1312.
"Victoria and Albert" Yacht—Removal of Silicate Cotton, etc., *July 27*, 1509.

Gothenburg
Trade Report Presented, *July 27*, 1458.

Goulding, Mr. E. A. [Wilts, Devizes]
Devizes Prison—Warder Hargrave's Pension, *July 16*, 74.
Water-tube Boilers on Naval Ships, *July 17*, 299.

Gourley Sir E. [Sunderland]
Navy—Torpedo Boats at the Naval Manœuvres, *July 27*, 1510.
Shah of Persia's visit—Suggested Naval Review, *July 26*, 1311.
"Victoria and Albert" Yacht—Removal of Silicate Cotton, etc., *July 27*, 1509.

Government Contracts
Army Contracts, *see* Army.

Granby, Marquess of
Army—Reserve Stores, etc., *July 17*, 205.

Gravel
Greystones Gravel, Removal of from Foreshore, etc.
Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 16*, 79.

Gray, Mr. E. [West Ham, N.]
Great Eastern Railway—Labour Dispute, Arbitration, etc., *July 26*, 1322.

Grazing Rents
Phœnix Park—Annual Receipts, etc.
Q. Mr. T. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 19*, 475.

Greaghlone
Letter-box—Neglecting to clear
Q. Mr. Daly; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 20*, 668.

Great Eastern Railway
Labour Dispute—Arbitration, etc.
Qs. Mr. Trevelyan, Mr. E. Gray; *As.* Mr. Ritchie, *July 26*, 1322.

Great Grimsby Street Tramways Bill
c. Con. July 17*, 215.
3R.* *July 20*, 636.
l. Commons Amendts.* *July 23*, 787; *July 24*, 985.

Great Indian Peninsula Railway Company Bill
l. 2R.* *July 17*, 189.
Committed, *July 19*, 410.
Reported without Amendt., *July 20*, 586.
3R.* *July 24*, 986.
Standing Orders, *July 16*, 1.

Great North of Ireland Railway
Sutton-Howth Tramway, *see* that title.

Great Northern Railway
Fares between Hornsey and King's Cross
Q. Mr. Stephens; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *July 26*, 1321.

Great Northern Railway Bill
l. Report from Committee of Selection, *July 16*, 4.
3R.* *July 19*, 410.
c. Lords Amendts.* *July 24*, 1037.

Great Northern Railway (Ireland) Bill
l. Report from Committee of Selection, *July 17*, 192.
Report from Select Committee and Bill Committed, *July 19*, 411.

Great Southern and Western Railway Bill
l. Commons Amendts.* *July 16*, 3.

Great Southern and Western and Waterford and Central, Ireland, Railway Companies Amalgamation Bill
l. Report from Joint Committee, *July 20*, 587.
3R. *July 27*, 1454.
c. 1R.* *July 27*, 1497.

Great Southern and Western and Waterford, Limerick and Western Railway Companies Amalgamation Bill
l. Reports from Joint Committee, *July 19*, 451; *July 20*, 587.
3R., *July 27*, 1450.
c 1R.* *July 27*, 1497.

Great Western Railway Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *July 17*, 189.
3R.* *July 23*, 786.
c. Lords Amendts., *July 27*, 1495.

Great Yarmouth
Fishermen and the Militia — Granting Furlough during Fishery Season
Q. Sir J. Colomb; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 27*, 1507.

Greece
Finances—Report Presented, *July 20*, 588.

Green Park
Piccadilly, Widening—Obtaining Strip of Park, Proposal to London County Council
Qs. Mr. Coghill, Mr. G. Bowles; *As.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 24*, 1059.

Greene, Mr. H. D. [Shrewsbury]
Naval Courts-martial — Application of Criminal Evidence Act, *July 24*, 1049.
South African War—Boers in British Hospitals, Number, Treatment, etc., *July 19*, 456.

Greenwich Hospital
Income and Expenditure Statement
Resolution (Mr. A. Chamberlain), *July 19*, 584.

Greenwich Observatory
Report of Astronomer Royal Presented, *July 19*, 414, 453.

Greeveguilla
Daily Delivery of Letters proposed
Q. Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 16*, 80.

Greville, Lord
Irish Railway Amalgamation Bills, 3R., *July 27*, 1450, 1453, 1454.

Grey, Earl
Agricultural Holdings Bill, *Com.*, *July 27*, 1479.

Grey, Sir E. [Northumberland, Berwick]
South African War
"Merits" of the War, not "Policy," *July 25*, 1252.
Rebels, Punishment of, Disfranchisement, etc., *July 25*, 1252.
Settlement after the War, *July 25*, 1253.

Greystones
Gravel—Removal of from Foreshore, etc.
Q. Mr. J. O'Connor ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 16*, 79.

Griffith, Mr. E. J. [Anglesey]
Agricultural Holdings Bill, 3R., *July 19*, 557.
Holyhead National School Teachers—Compelling Nonconformist Teachers to attend Church of England Services—Pupil Teachers' Salaries, etc., *July 24*, 1055, 1056, 1057.

Guatemala
Trade Report Presented, *July 27*, 1458.

Gull, Sir C. [Devon, Barnstaple]
Devon, North—Night Mail Service Delays, Improvement of Train Service, etc., *July 20*, 657.
Railway Passengers' Luggage—Amount of Free Luggage, etc., *July 26*, 1321.
Increased Scale allowed by Midland Company, etc., *July 16*, 74.

Gully, Rt. Hon. W. C.
see Speaker.

Gun Fatality at Camden Fort
see Camden Fort.

Guns
Arms and Ammunition, Exportation of, etc., *see* Arms and Ammunition.
Arms
Field Artillery
Os. Sir H. Vincent, *July 27*, 1573 ; Mr. Warner, 1585.
Movable Guns of Position—Obsolete Guns in South Africa, etc.
O. Earl of Wemyss, *July 17*, 204.
Reserve of Stores
Wyndham's, Mr., Statement, *July 27*, 1536.
Navy
Armaments for Armoured Cruisers
O. Capt. Phillpotts, *July 17*, 311.
Erosion of Guns by Cordite—Committee of Inquiry
Qs. Sir C. Dilke, Mr. Paulton ; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 17*, 226.
Reserve of Guns, etc.
Os. Sir C. Dilke ; Mr. Goschen, *July 17*, 337, 338.

Gurdon, Sir B. [Norfolk, N.]
British Central African Protectorate—Chiromo and Lake Nyassa Railway, Construction of, etc., *July 20*, 651.
British Central Africa Rifles—Misconduct of, at Mauritius, Laying Papers on the Table, *July 20*, 651.

Gwalior, Maharajah of
see India—Maharajah of Gwalior.

Gwyrfai Rural District Council Water Bill
c. 3R.* *July 18*, 341.
l. Commons Amendts.* *July 19*, 411 ; *July 20*, 585.

Hague Conference
Ratification of Convention
Q. Mr. J. A. Pease ; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 20*, 670.

Haldane, Mr. R. B. [Haddington]
Colonial Stock Bill, 2R., *July 23*, 971.
Companies Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1078, 1098.
Imitation of County Court Process Bill, 2R., *July 23*, 975.

Halifax, Viscount
Ritualism in the Church—Disobedience of Clergy, etc., *July 16*, 28.

Halifax Corporation Bill
l. 3R.* *July 26*, 1266.

Halsbury, Earl of—*Lord Chancellor*
Merchant Shipping (Liability of Shipowners and others) Bill, 3R., *July 20*, 619, 620 ; *July 26*, 1269, 1270.
Prohibition of Exportation of Arms Bill, 2R., *July 23*, 842.
Reading Clerkship Vacancy—Appointment of Legal Assistant, etc., *July 24*, 1021.
Tithe Rent-charge (Ireland) Bill, *Rep.*, *July 26*, 1278.

Hamilton, Rt. Hon. Lord G.—*Secretary of State for India* [Middlesex, Ealing]
Army
Artillery — Reduction of Guns in Heavy Field Batteries, *July 24*, 1053.
British Officers in Native Regiments, *July 26*, 1314.
Commander-in-Chief—Filling Vacant Appointment, *July 19*, 469.
Troops Withdrawn from Establishment for Service outside India
British Troops, Number withdrawn, etc., *July 20*, 643.
Cost—Imperial Exchequer defraying, *July 19*, 455.
Total Number, etc., *July 17*, 219.
Budget Statement, *July 26*, 1345—(*for* details, *see* India).
China—Anti-Foreign Rising, etc.
Hospital and Medical Arrangements for, *July 26*, 1299.
Hospital Ship — Maharajah of Gwalior's Offer, *July 23*, 854.

[*cont.*

Hamilton, Rt. Hon. Lord G.—*cont.*
Cholera Outbreak
Additional Medical Officers, etc., *July 19*, 468.
Medical Staff in Famine Camps, etc., *July 20*, 652.
Number of Deaths, *July 20*, 652.
Education—Technical and Art Schools and Classes—Number, Expenditure, etc, *July 17*, 230.
Famine
Advances to Ryots, *July 16*, 71.
Cattle, Mortality among—Funds available for Supply of Fodder, Seed, Grain, etc., *July 19*, 467; *July 23*, 864.
Land Revenue Remissions in Bombay and North-West Provinces, *July 19*, 466.
Loans to Native States, *July 19*, 465; *July 23*, 865.
Rainfall—Total in affected Districts, etc., *July 19*, 467.
Relief Administration—State Aid and Private Benevolence, *July 24*, 1051.
Statistics—Number of Persons Relieved, etc., *July 23*, 864.
Penal Legislation—Withdrawing recent Legislation, proposed, *July 19*, 468.
Railways, Purchase of, by Indian Government
Contracts—Policy in Determining future Contracts, *July 23*, 867.
Rate of Interest in settling Annuities, etc., *July 23*, 865, 866; *July 26*, 1314.
Rangoon Outrage—Removal of Col. Rolland from Command, *July 24*, 1052.
Taxation — Amount yielded by New Taxation since 1886, Return, *July 19*, 469.
Trade Statistics, *July 26*, 1315.

Hamilton, Motherwell, and Wishaw Tramways Bill
c. Lords Amendts.* *July 16*, 53.
l. Commons Amendts.* *July 17*, 190; *July 19*, 411.

Hammond (G. H.) Company Bill
c. Reported without Amendt., *July 17*, 216.
3R.* *July 20*, 636.

Hanbury, Rt. Hon. R. W.—*Financial Secretary to the Treasury* [Preston]
Brehon Laws, Publication of, *July 26*, 1337.
Cable Communication, Imperial Telegraphic Communication—Committee of Inquiry, *July 23*, 867, 868.
Civil Service
Abstractors—Terms of Service, *July 27*, 1519.

Hanbury, Rt. Hon. R. W.—*cont.*
Civil Service—*cont.*
Junior Civil Service Examinations, *July 26*, 1329.
County Court Fees—Report of Committee, *July 27*, 1520.
Customs Watchers—Improved Conditions of Service, *July 26*, 1330.
Devizes Prison—Warder Hargrave's Pension, *July 16*, 74.
District Messenger Company
Non-renewal of Licence, *July 23*, 873.
Royalty paid to the Post Office, etc., *July 26*, 1328.
Dukinfield Postmastership, Number of Applicants, *July 17*, 233.
Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, Intro., *July 23*, 889.
Historical Manuscripts Commission—Publication of Documents by British Museum Authorities, etc., *July 17*, 234.
Income Tax Deductions—Incomes accruing after April 5, etc., *July 23*, 872.
Irish Questions
Academy, Royal Irish—Grant-in-aid for Salary of Irish Scribe and printing Manuscripts, etc., *July 19*, 480.
Belfast Postal Arrangements—Later Delivery of Letters, proposed, *July 24*, 1063.
Cahir Post Office—New Office, *July 26*, 1332.
Castlebar Post Office—Site for New Office, *July 20*, 667.
Coagh Postal Service, *July 26*, 1333.
Cootehill Postmastership—Condition attached to previous Appointment, *July 19*, 473.
Cork Postal Arrangements—Memorial from the Residents of Ashburton, Dillon's Cross, etc., *July 26*, 1336.
Cornalaragh Postal Deliveries—House to House Delivery, *July 20*, 668.
Drumconrath Postal Arrangements, *July 26*, 1335.
Dublin Botanical Gardens—Expenditure since 1890, *July 19*, 477.
Dublin Sorting Staff, *July 26*, 1333.
Dundoran Mails, *July 26*, 1334.
Fishguard and Rosslare Railways, Carrying out Undertaking embodied in Agreement, etc., *July 26*, 1338.
Greaghlone Letter-box—Neglecting to clear, *July 20*, 668.
Greeveguilla—Daily Delivery of Letters, *July 16*, 80.
Greystones Gravel—Removal of from Foreshore, etc., *July 16*, 79.
Howth Petty Sessions—Prosecution of Boatmen by the Board of Works, etc., *July 24*, 1062.

Hanbury, Rt. Hon. R. W.—*cont.*
Irish Questions—*cont.*
Kilkenny County Postal Arrangements, *July 26*, 1333
Limavady Postmastership, *July 27*, 1523.
Limerick Telegraph Messengers—Pay, etc., *July 26*, 1332.
Listowel-Ballybunion Railway—Cost, *July 16*, 80.
Newbliss
Delivery of Telegrams by Girls, *July 27*, 1523.
Late Postmistress Residing in Post Office, *July 19*, 473.
Postman attending Orange Demonstration at Clones, *July 24*, 1063.
Phœnix Park
Grazing Rents—Annual Receipts, etc., *July 19*, 475.
Ornamental Waters, Trees, etc., *July 20*, 668, 669.
Rathfriland Postmastership — Appointment of Person Residing in Downpatrick Street, *July 17*, 239.
Surveyor of Buildings—Appointment of Assistant Surveyor—Rejection of Mr. Carden, Successful Candidate, *July 19*, 476.
Sutton-Howth Tramway — Laying Tramway by the side of the Road instead of on the Road, etc., *July 19*, 478.
Letter-boxes with two compartments—Number in East Central District, etc., *July 16*, 75.
Luggage—Railway Companies' Free Luggage Allowances, etc., *July 16*, 75.
Mails
Australian Mails—Delay in Transit from Naples to London, *July 16*, 70.
Devon, North—Night Mail Service Delays, Improvement of Train Service, etc., *July 20*, 658.
India and Australia—Delay in Despatch of English Mails, *July 16*, 69.
Norwood Green Postal Deliveries, *July 26*, 1325.
Post Office Employees
Holidays for Postmen, *July 26*, 1327.
Liverpool Staff—Promotion of Clerk to be Superintendent, etc., *July 20*, 656.
Rural Postmen's Shelters, *July 27*, 1518.
Sorters' Examinations, *July 26*, 1327.
Straw Hats for Postmen, *July 26*, 1326.
Uniforms — Postmen's, Weight of Summer and Winter Uniforms, etc., *July 27*, 1518.
York—Assistant Inspector of Postmen keeping Shop with Beer Off-licence, *July 20*, 655.

Hanbury, Rt. Hon. R. W.—*cont.*
Post Office Sites Bill, *Com.*, *July 18*, 388, 393, 394, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401; 3R., *July 19*, 582.
Postage—Excess Charge on Unstamped Letters, etc., *July 23*, 872.
Postcards—Returning Undelivered Postcards, *July 19*, 471.
Prison-made Goods Act — Seizure of Foreign Goods, *July 23*, 872.
Public Works Loans Bill, *Com.*, *July 23*, 980, 981, 982, 983.
Scotch Questions — Postal Deliveries, Delay in Delivery of Newspapers in South Western District, *July 20*, 659, 660.
Telegraphists
Central Telegraph Office
Overtime—Appointment of Additional Telegraphists, etc., *July 19*, 472.
Punishment of, for Exceeding Dinner Interval, etc., *July 20*, 656.
Harwich Post Office Staff—Transferring Female Telegraphists to Enfield, etc., *July 20*, 657.
Liverpool—Promotion of No. 34 on the Seniority List, *July 17*, 234.
Trade Marks — "Foreign Origin," Importation of decorated Tin Boxes, etc., *July 27*, 1519.
Transfer of Work from General Post Office to Mount Pleasant
Delay in Delivery of Letters at Sheringham, *July 23*, 871.
Postmen's Overtime Pay, *July 24*, 1058.

Handcuffs
Irish Police Handcuffs—Place of Manufacture, Cost, etc.
Q. Mr. T. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 23*, 878.

Hargrave, Warder
Pension—Apportioning between Imperial and Local Funds, etc.
Q. Mr. Goulding; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 16*, 74.

Harrington, Mr. T. [Dublin, Harbour]
Intermediate Education (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *July 19*, 519.
Irish Language, Use of, in National Schools in place of English, *July 20*, 709.

Harris, Lord
Death Certification—Legislation, *July 17*, 211.
Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill, 2R., *July 20*, 621, 634, 635.
Local Government Provisional Orders Bills, Suspension of Standing Orders, *July 16*, 5.
Poor Removal Bill, 3R., *July 19*, 419.

Harrison, Mr.
South African Hospitals Commission, Appointment
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 23*, 855.

Harwich
Post Office Staff—Transferring Female Telegraphist to Enfield, Removal Expenses, etc.
Q. Mr. Goddard; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 20*, 657.

Harwood, Mr. G. [Bolton]
Coal Supply—Reserve for Naval Purposes, Exportation of Coal to Foreign Countries, etc., *July 26*, 1313.
Education—New Science and Art Regulations, *July 27*, 1515.
Dublin Corporation Bill, *Con.*, *July 26*, 1295.
House of Commons—Accommodation for Members, *July 26*, 1324.
Submarine Boats
Experiments—Watching Experiments Abroad, etc., *July 17*, 303.
French Submarine Boats, Trials, *July 26*, 1310.

Haslett, Sir J. H. [Belfast, N.]
Belfast Postal Arrangements—Later Delivery of Letters, proposed, *July 24*, 1063.
Companies Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1067.
Intermediate Education (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *July 19*, 518, 519.

Hastings Corporation Bill
l. 2R.* *July 19*, 410.
Reported with Amendts., *July 26*, 1266.
Standing Orders, *July 16*, 1.

Hastings Tramways Bill
l. 3R.* *July 16*, 2.
c. Lords Amendts.* *July 23*, 845.

Hayden, Mr. J. P. (Roscommon, S.)
Kitteevan Drum and Fife Band Demonstrations—Police Interference, *July 23*, 880.
Queenstown—Police Landing Regulations, *July 20*, 666.

Hazell, Mr. W. [Leicester]
Bail Regulations—Detention of Persons awaiting Trial, *July* 23, 875.
Geological Survey Maps, Limited Sale of, etc., *July 23*, 869.
Income Tax Deductions—Incomes accruing after April 5, etc., *July 23*, 872.

Healy, Mr. M. [Cork]
Army—Shirt Contracts, Non-acceptance of Tenders from Irish Firms, etc., *July 23*, 861.

Healy, Mr. M.—*cont.*
Constabulary, Royal Irish—House Rent Allowances, *July 23*, 880.
County Courts (Ireland) Bill—Circulating Draft of Rules, etc., *July 23*, 878.
Cork Postal Arrangements—Memorial from the Residents of Ashburton, Dillon's Cross, etc., *July 26*, 1335.
Fishguard and Rosslare Railways—Company carrying out undertaking embodied in Agreement, etc., *July 26*, 1338.
Imitation of County Court Process Bill, 2R., *July 23*, 976.
Kilworth Rifle Range—Acquisition of adjoining Land, *July 23*, 860, 861.
Land Commission—Cork Sitting, Delays, etc., *July 24*, 1062.
Local Government Returns, *July 23*, 878, 879.
Local Government Rules and Orders—Return, *July 20*, 666.
Military Lands Bill, 2R., *July 23*, 910, 913.
Muzzling Regulations in Cork, *July 27*, 1522.
Public House Licences, New Licences, etc.—Annual Return, proposed, *July 23*, 879; *July 26*, 1337.

Healy, Mr. T. M. [Louth, N.]
Companies Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1152, 1157.
Constabulary, Royal Irish
Batons and Handcuffs — Place of Manufacture, etc., *July 23*, 878.
Tipperary and Limerick, Medical Appointment for, *July 19*, 474.
Dublin
Botanical Gardens—Expenditure since 1890, *July 19*, 477.
Equalisation of Rates—Legislation proposed, etc., *July 23*, 886.
Dublin Corporation Bill, *Con.*, *July 26*, 1290, 1294.
Elementary School Teachers' Superannuation (Isle of Man) Bill, 2R., *July 26*, 1448.
Food Preservatives—Report of Committee, etc., *July 26*, 1317.
Imitation of County Court Process Bill, 2R., *July 23*, 977.
Industrial Schools, Ireland, Vote for, *July 20*, 770, 771.
Intermediate Education Board Clerks, *July 27*, 1524.
Intermediate Education (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *July 19*, 496, 497, 506; *Com.*, *July 26*, 1439, 1440, 1441, 1442, 1443, 1444.
Irish Language, Use of, in Irish Schools in place of English, *July 20*, 721.
Limavady Postmastership, *July 27*, 1523.
Lunatic Asylums Board—Supplementary Estimate, *July 27*, 1520.
Malicious Injuries, Grants for—Including in Judicial Statistics, *July 27*, 1521.

Healy, Mr. T. M.—*cont.*
Meath County Council and Staffordshire Bye-law, *July 26*, 1338.
Military Lands Bill, 2R., *July 23*, 920.
Phœnix Park
Grazing Rents, Annual Receipts, etc., *July 19*, 475.
Ornamental Waters, Trees, etc., *July 20*, 668, 669.
Public Works Loans Bill, *Com.*, *July 23*, 979, 980, 981, 982.
South African War
Expenditure — Irish Contribution, *July 27*, 1637.
Officers ordered Home—Treatment of, etc., *July 27*, 1635.
Sutton to Censure Railway, *July 26*, 1339.
Sutton-Howth Tramway—Laying Tramway by the side of the Road instead of on the Road, etc., *July 19*, 477; *July 23*, 881, 882.
Water Gas, Use of, in Dublin, etc., *July 20*, 654.

Hedderwick, Mr. T. C. H. [Wick Burghs]
China—Anti-Foreign Rising
Chinese Representatives in England, Official Recognition of, *July 23*, 852.
Hospital Accommodation at Wei-hai-wei, etc., *July 23*, 853.
Companies Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1099, 1100.
Volunteers Bill, 2R., *July 18*, 351, 375.
Water-tube Boilers and Naval Ships—Expenditure on Belleville Boilers since 1895, *July 19*, 463.

Hemel Hempstead Corporation (Water) Bill
c. Con. July 25*, 1161.

Hemphill, Rt. Hon. C. H. [Tyrone, N.]
Intermediate Education (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *July 19*, 515.
Irish Language, Use of, in Irish Schools in place of English, *July 20*, 742.
Tithe Rent-charge (Ireland) Bill, 3R., *July 16*, 125; *Re-com.*, *July 16*, 139, 140, 142.

Heneage, Lord
Agricultural Holdings Bill, *Com.*, *July 27*, 1494.
Educational Grants—Differential Treatment of Rural and Urban Schools, *July 24*, 1024.
Merchant Shipping (Liability of Shipowners and others) Bill, 3R., *July 20*, 620; *July 26*, 1271.
Tents for the Army, Supply of Horses in South Africa, etc., *July 17*, 205.

Henderson, Mr. A. [Staffordshire, W.]
Companies Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1139.

Hereford, Bishop of
Education Bill, 2R., *July 23*, 818.
Educational Grants—Differential Treatment of Urban and Rural Schools, *July 24*, 1030.

Herring Trade
St. Petersburg—Facilities for discharge and storage
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *July 16*, 71.

Hickman, Sir A. [Wolverhampton, W.]
Companies Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1087, 1099.
Income Tax—Interest paid by Municipal Authorities and Interest paid by Public Companies and Private Persons—Rate of Income Tax chargeable on, *July 19*, 470.

Hicks-Beach
see Beach.

High Court of Justice
Account of Receipts and Expenditure Presented, *July 19*, 414, 453.
Ireland—Court of Probate Division—Annual Account of Receipts and Disbursements Presented, *July 19*, 414, 452.

Highways and Bridges Act (1891) Amendment Bill
Bill Withdrawn, *July 23*, 888.

Historical Manuscripts Commission
Report Presented, *July 26*, 1269, 1297.
Restricting Operations to Manuscripts belonging to Private Persons—Laying Document on the Table
Q. Sir H. Fowler; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 17*, 234.

Hoare, Mr. E. B. [Hampstead]
Companies Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1136, 1155.
Hong Kong — Appointment of Army Chaplain, *July 19*, 462.

Hogan, Mr. J. F. [Tipperary, Mid]
Australasian Commonwealth
Governor General's Official Residence, *July 16*, 69; *July 20*, 651.
Northern Territory, Annexation to South Australia in 1863, etc., *July 24*, 1050.
Mails
Australian Mails—Delay in Transit from Naples to London, *July 16*, 70.
India and Australia — Delay in despatch of English Mails, *July 16*, 69.
Tonga Islands—Proclamation of British Protectorate, *July 24*, 1050.

Holyhead
National School Teachers
Compelling Noncomformist Teachers to attend Church of England Services, etc. — Case of N. Roberts—Erection of Board School, proposed, etc.
Q. Mr. E. J. Griffith; *A.* Sir J. Gorst, *July 24*, 1055.
Pupil Teachers—Salaries, Non-fulfilment of Agreement
Q. Mr. E. J. Griffith; *A.* Sir J. Gorst, *July 24*, 1057.

Home Defences
see Defences of the Empire.

Home Office
Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. Sir M. W. Ridley.
Under Secretary—Rt. Hon. J. Collings.

Home Rule
"Killing Home Rule by Kindness."
Os. Mr. Dillon, Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 16*, 174.

Honduras
Treaty of Friendship, Commerce, and Navigation Presented, *July 19*, 413, 453.

Honnen Spruit
see South African War.

Hong Kong
Army Chaplain, Appointment of
Q. Mr. B. Hoare; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 19*, 462.
Dock Accommodation for Naval Ships—New Works
Os. Viscount Sidmouth, Earl of Hopetoun, Earl Spencer, *July 17*, 207.
Holding Troops in Readiness to Protect Europeans in Yang-tsze Valley, etc.
Q. Mr. Yerburgh; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *July 20*, 642.

Hopetoun, Earl of
Dock Accommodation for Naval Ships—New Works, etc., *July 17*, 208, 209.

Hornsey
Railway Fares to King's Cross
Q. Mr. Stephens; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *July 26*, 1321.

Horses
South African War, *see* that title.

Hospital and Medical Arrangements
China, *see* that title—Anti-Foreign Rising, etc.
South African War, *see* that title.

Hospital Ship
Maharajah of Gwalior's Offer, *see* India—Maharajah of Gwalior.

House of Commons
Accommodation for Members
Q. Mr. Harwood; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 26*, 1324.
Business of the House, Committees, etc., *see* those titles.
Committee Rooms
Outside Blinds, Ventilation, etc.
Qs. Mr. Cohen, Sir J. Colomb; *As.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 26*, 1325; *Q.* Mr. Talbot; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 27*, 1513.

House of Lords
Judicial Business — Additional Legal Assistant—Appointing Solicitor to fill Vacant Reading Clerkship
Debate (Lords), *July 24*, 1011.
Offices—Report from Select Committee Presented, *July 19*, 415.
Reading Clerk, Appointment of—Recommendations of Committee—Power of Appointing reverting to Clerk of Parliament, etc.
Debate (Lords), *July 24*, 1011.
Sat First—Earl of Strafford, after the death of his Brother, *July 20*, 585.

Houses of Parliament
Works Department—Employees' Grievances
Q. Mr. Labouchere; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 16*, 76.

Housing of the Working Classes
London School Board Rehousing Scheme—Proposed Erection of Dwellings in Parnell Road, Bow, etc.
Q. Mr. Pickersgill; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *July 16*, 73.
Southwark—Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill, *July 16*, 49, 51.

Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill
l. 2R.* *July 20*, 621.
Com., *July 23*, 842.
Reported without Amendts., *July 24*, 989.
Reported with Amendts., *July 26*, 1283.
3R.* *July 27*, 1495.

Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill
Debate on Second Reading, *July 20*, 621.
Arbitration, 624.
Borrowing Powers—Extension of Time for Repayment of Loans, 626, 628, 631, 632.
Compulsory Registration of Real Owners of Property, 629.
Hire of Land, Compulsory Powers, etc., 625, 630.
Insanitary Areas, Compulsory Clearance without Compensation to Owners, suggested, 629.

Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill—*cont.*
Debate on Second Reading—*cont.*
Leasing Land to Third Person, 623.
Local Authorities, Powers of, 621, 630.
"Lodging-house," Definition of in Act of 1890, 635.
Re-housing Displaced Persons, 633.
Right of Appeal against Local Authorities, 623.
Sites, Acquirement of, Cost, Procedure, etc., 621, 629, 632, 633.
Workmen's Trams, Trains, etc., 624, 629.

Hove
Recreation Ground—Raising Loan, etc.
Q. Sir. H. Fletcher; *A.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *July 27*, 1514.

Howth Petty Sessions
Boatmen, Prosecution of, by Board of Works—Dredging Harbour, proposed
Qs. Mr. P. O'Brien; *As.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, Mr. Hanbury, *July 24*, 1061.

Hughes, Case of
Monaghan Petty Sessions—Right of Appeal denied, etc.
Q. Mr. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 16*, 81.

Humphreys-Owen, Mr. A. C. [Montgomery]
Agricultural Holdings Bill, 3R., *July 19*, 573.
Martial Law in Cape Colony—Detention of Prisoners in Civil or Military Prisons, etc., *July 16*, 64; *July 17*, 221; *July 26*, 1301.
Volunteers Bill, *Com.*, *July 23*, 956, 959.

Huts for the Army
Supply of, etc.
O. Mr. Warner, *July 27*, 1584.
Statement (Mr. Wyndham), *July 27*, 1532.

Ilfracombe Improvement Bill
l. 2R.* *July 24*, 986.

Imitation of County Court Process Bill
c. 1R.* *July 17*, 240.
2R., *July 23*, 975.

Imitation of County Court Process Bill
Debate on Second Reading, *July 23*, 975.
Contempt of Court, Offence constituting, 976.
Procedure, Method of, 975, 977.

Imperial Defence
see Defence of the Empire.

Imperial Institute
Indian Section—Annual Report Presented, *July 19*, 414, 453.

Imperial Telegraphic Communication
Committee of Inquiry, Constitution and Terms of Reference
Q. Sir E. Sassoon; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 23*, 867.

Imposts
Taxes and Imposts—Return Presented, *July 19*, 452.

Imprisonment for Debt
see Debtors.

Incense
Use of, in the Church of England
Debate (Lords), *July 16*, 10.

Income Tax
Bank of England deducting Increased Rate of Income Tax from Interest Warrants maturing on or about July 1st
Q. Mr. Maclean; *A.* Sir M. H. Beach, *July 17*, 231.
Deductions — Incomes accruing after April 5th, etc.
Q. Mr. Hazell; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 23*, 872.
Jamaica Railway Debentures—Additional Income Tax deducted from Dividends matured before Jan. 24th
Q. Mr. Bartley; *A.* Sir M. H. Beach, *July 17*, 231.
Interest paid by Municipal Authorities and Interest paid by Public Companies and Private Persons—Rate of Income Tax chargeable
Q. Sir A. Hickman; *A.* Sir M. H. Beach, *July 19*, 470.

India
Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. Lord G. Hamilton.
Army
Arms—Modern Rifles for Native Regiments, etc.
Statement (Lord G. Hamilton), *July 26*, 1363.
Artillery — Reduction of Guns in heavy Field Batteries
Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *July 24*, 1053.
British Officers in Native Regiments, Increase in Number of—Selection of Officers, Cost, etc.
Q. Mr. Stanhope; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *July 26*, 1314.
China, Anti-Foreign Rising—Indian Troops for China
Hospital and Medical Arrangements
Q. Mr. H. Roberts; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *July 26*, 1299.
(*see also* sub-heading Troops withdrawn from Establishment for Service outside India.)
Commander-in-Chief—Filling Vacant Appointment
Q. Mr. Buchanan; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *July 19*, 469.
Commander-in-Chief and the Viceroy's Executive Council
Q. Mr. Maclean; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *July 17*, 218.

India—*cont.*

Army—*cont.*

Expenditure

Hamilton's, Lord G., Statement, *July 26*, 1349, 1362.

Reduction in Expenditure—"No hope of Reduction"

O. Lord G. Hamilton, *July 25*, 1364.

(*see also* sub-heading Finance, Expenditure Commission, etc.)

Hospital Ship for China—Maharajah of Gwalior's Offer, *see* sub-heading Maharajah of Gwalior.

Loss of two distinguished Soldiers (Sir D. Stewart, Sir W. Lockhart)

Os. Lord G. Hamilton, *July 26*, 1364; Sir H. Fowler, 1367.

North-West Frontier Policy

O. Lord G. Hamilton, *July 26*, 1364.

Troops withdrawn from Establishment for Service outside India

British and Native Troops for China—Total Strength, Replacing Troops, etc.

Qs. Mr. Maclean, Mr. Buchanan, Mr. S. MacNeill; *As.* Lord G. Hamilton, *July 17*, 218.

British Troops, Number withdrawn, etc.

Q. Mr. H. Roberts; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *July 20*, 643.

Cost, Imperial Exchequer defraying

Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *July 19*, 455; *O.* Sir M. H. Beach, *July 26*, 1387.

Establishment in excess of the Requirements

Statement (Lord G. Hamilton), *July 26*, 1363.

Return of Troops from South Africa

O. Sir C. Dilke, *July 27*, 1540.

British Administration, Improved Methods of Administration—"Are they as Palatable to the People as the Older and Cruder System?"

O. Lord G. Hamilton, *July 26*, 1365.

Cholera Outbreak in Famine Districts—Number of Deaths, Additional Medical Officers, etc.

Qs. Mr. C. P. Scott; *As.* Lord G. Hamilton, *July 19*, 467; *July 20*, 652.

Statement (Lord G. Hamilton), *July 26*, 1354.

Contagious Diseases—Petition for Alteration of Law, *July 20*, 638.

Currency, *see* sub-heading Gold Currency.

Defence of the British Empire—India's Contribution, Comparison with the Colonies

O. Mr. Souttar, *July 26*, 1377.

India—*cont.*

Disputed Questions between the India Office and Public Offices in England—Arbitration.

O. Sir M. Bhownaggree, *July 26*, 1400—(*see also* sub-heading Expenditure—Report of Royal Commission).

Expenditure, *see* sub-heading Finance.

Famine

Advances and Gifts to Agriculturists for Seed, Cattle, etc.—Return Presented, *July 23*, 795, 848.

Advances to Land Cultivators—Conditions

Q. Mr. Buchanan; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *July 16*, 71.

Appeal to the Archbishop of Canterbury

O. Sir M. Bhownaggree, *July 26*, 1404.

Appeal to the Public

O. Sir H. Fowler, *July 26*, 1370.

Canadian Government Grant, proposed

Q. Sir W. Wedderburn; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *July 24*, 1052.

Cattle, Mortality among — Funds available for Supply of Fodder, Seed Grain, and Cattle to Cultivators, etc.

Qs. Mr. C. P. Scott; *As.* Lord G. Hamilton, *July 19*, 467; *July 23*, 864.

Cholera, *see* that sub-heading.

Imperial Grant

O. Lord Kinnaird, *July 23*, 835; *O.* Sir H. Fowler, *July 26*, 1369.

Grant of £5,000,000, proposed Motion (Mr. Souttar), *July 26*, 1372.

Irrigation Works, *see* that sub-heading.

Land Revenue Remissions in Bombay and North-west Provinces—Measures taken in 1896-7

Q. Sir W. Wedderburn; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *July 19*, 465.

Loans to Native States

Q. Mr. C. P. Scott; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *July 23*, 865.

Amount of—Loan to Bhaunagar State, etc.

Q. Sir W. Wedderburn; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *July 19*, 464.

Mansion House Fund, Scottish and Lancashire Subscriptions

O. Lord G. Hamilton, *July 26*, 1423.

Officials and their Work of Relief—Appreciation of

Os. Lord G. Hamilton, *July 26*, 1354, 1366; Sir H. Fowler, 1372; Mr. Souttar, 1373.

Rainfall and Monsoon, *see* those sub-headings.

India—*cont.*
Famine—*cont.*
Relief Administration—State Aid and Private Benevolence
Q. Sir W. Wedderburn; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *July 24*, 1051.
Remedial Measures
O. Sir M. Bhownaggree, *July 26*, 1398.
Statement—Lord G. Hamilton, *July 26*, 1346.
Appeal to the Public, 1356.
Cause, Area Affected, etc., 1346.
Difficulties which the Local Officials have had to Contend with, 1354.
Expenditure — Total Amount which the Famine has Cost India, 1352.
Gujerat Province—Serious Outlook, 1351, 1353.
Imperial Government Aid, 1356, 1358.
Klopsch's, Dr., Opinion on the Administration of Relief, *July 26*, 1355.
Loans to Native States, 1352.
Losses in Crops and Cattle, 1347.
Mortality, 1353.
Relief Administration, 1353.
Statistics
Q. Mr. C. P. Scott; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *July 23*, 864.
Finance
Accounts and Estimates—Explanatory Memorandum Presented, *July 16*, 8, 56.
Audit—Report of Expenditure Commission, etc.
O. Sir H. Fowler, *July 26*, 1371.
Budget—Earlier date of Introduction
O. Sir M. Bhownaggree, *July 26*, 1398.
Budget—Statement (Lord G. Hamilton), *July 26*, 1345.
Apportionment of Charge between India and the United Kingdom, 1360.
Arms for Native Troops, etc., Expenditure on, 1363.
Army Expenditure, 1349, 1362.
Exchange, Stability of—"Key-note of the Situation," 1360.
Famine Expenditure, 1349, 1352—(*see also* sub-heading Famine).
Gold Currency, Result, 1361.
Loan, 1352.
Surplus, 1348, 1350.
Transfer of £250,000 to the Revenues of India, 1360.
Welby's, Lord, Commission Recommendations, 1359, 1360.
Capitation Grant Contribution
O. Sir H. Fowler, *July 26*, 1372.

India—*cont.*
Finance—*cont.*
Civil Expenditure, Report of Commission
O. Sir H. Fowler, *July 26*, 1372.
Debt, Increase in
O. Sir H. Fowler, *July 26*, 1371.
"Drain of the Wealth of India"
O. Sir M. Bhownaggree, *July 26*, 1400, 1404.
Expenditure Commission, Recommendations, etc.
O. Sir H. Fowler, *July 26*, 1370.
Hamilton's, Lord G., Statement, *July 26*, 1359, 1360.
Transfer of £250,000 to the Revenues of India—Recommendations of Commission, etc.
Os. Lord Onslow, *July 20*, 610; Sir H. Fowler, *July 26*, 1372; Sir M. Bhownaggree, 1400.
Expenditure, Report of Royal Commission
Debate (Lords) *July 20*, 595.
Apportionment of Charge between the two Governments, 595, 606, 609.
Sum of £250,000 for the Relief of Indian Revenue, 610.
Arrears of Over-charges—Eight years Arrears should be allowed, 600.
Audit System, 603, 608.
Capitation Grant, 609.
Claims of English and Indian Taxpayers, 601, 616.
Colonies, Aid to, Analogy, 604, 616.
Constitution of the Commission, 597.
Consular Service Charges, 607.
Debt of India, 602.
Disputes between the Public Offices, 604 — Arbitration, etc., 606, 607, 613.
Economical Administration, 601, 605.
Growth of Non-Effective Service, 603.
History of the Question, 595.
India Office, Cost of—Imperial Exchequer Contribution, 604.
Military Charges, 599, 617.
Aden Fortress, 604, 617.
India's Interest beyond the Frontier, 611, 617.
India, a Reserve for the Empire, 614.

[*cont.*

India—*cont.*
Famine—*cont.*
Expenditure, Report, etc.—*cont.*
Debate [Lords]—*cont.*
Military Charges—*cont.*
Lord Lansdowne's Despatch of 1890, 599, 611.
Military Expeditions—Geographical Limits within which India should have separate and distinct Interest, 604.
Navy in Indian Waters—Contribution, 608.
Railway and Irrigation Works, 603.
Recommendations of Commission, 598.
Sentimental side of the Question, 617, 618.
Settlement of the Question, 600.
Taxation—1861-96, 601.
Imperial Government Aid, *see* sub-headings Famine and Finance—Expenditure.
Military Men in the Council—Removal of the Commander-in-Chief, proposed
O. Sir H. Fowler, *July 26*, 1371.
Revenue Accounts referred to Committee of the whole House, *July 18*, 343.
Taxation—Amount yielded by New Taxation since 1886, Return
Q. Sir W. Wedderburn; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *July 19*, 469.
Foreign Policy determined by Imperial rather than Indian Considerations
O. Sir M. Bhownaggree, *July 26*, 1400.
Gold Currency
Effect on Trade
O. Sir H. Fowler, *July 26*, 1367
Result—Statement (Lord G. Hamilton), *July 26*, 1361.
Imperial Institute, Indian Section, *see* Imperial Institute.
Industrial, Technical, and Art Schools and Classes—Number, Expenditure, etc.
Q. Sir M. Bhownaggree; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *July 17*, 230.
Industrial and Technical Teaching—Remedy against Famine
O. Sir M. Bhownaggree, *July 26*, 1401.
Irrigation and Railway Works
Os. Mr. J. Walton, *July 26*, 1395; Mr. H. Roberts, 1407.
Expenditure on, etc.
Os. Lord Kinnaird, Earl of Onslow, *July 23*, 834.
Land
Assessment
O. Mr. H. Roberts, *July 26*, 1409.

India—*cont.*
Land—*cont.*
Assessment—*cont.*
Smith's, Col. B., Recommendations, etc.
O. Mr. Maclean, *July 26*, 1392.
Produce, Decrease in Fertility of the Land
O. Mr. Maclean, *July 26*, 1393.
Revenue Remissions in Bombay and North-West Provinces — Measures taken in 1896-7.
Q. Sir W. Wedderburn; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *July 19*, 465.
Loyalty of the Princes—South African War and China Expedition
References to in Debate on the Indian Budget, *July 26*, 1369, 1390, 1427, 1428.
Maharajah of Gwalior's Offer of Hospital Ship for China
O. Lord G. Hamilton, *July 23*, 853; *Q.* Mr. H. Roberts; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *July 26*, 1299; *Os.* Sir H. Fowler, *July 26*, 1369; Mr. Maclean, 1390; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 1428.
Mail Service—Delay in Despatch of English Mails
Q. Mr. Hogan; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 16*, 69.
Monsoon
Q. Lord Sandhurst; *A.* Earl of Onslow, *July 16*, 9.
Serious Outlook in the Gujerat Province
O. Lord G. Hamilton, *July 26*, 1351.
Statement (Lord G. Hamilton), *July 26*, 1346, 1351.
North-West Frontier Policy
O. Lord G. Hamilton, *July 26*, 1364.
Penal Legislation—Withdrawing Recent Legislation, proposed
Q. Sir W. Wedderburn; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *July 19*, 468.
Railways, Purchase of, by Indian Government
Contracts—Policy in determining Future Contracts
Q. Mr. Gordon; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *July 23*, 867.
Rate of Interest in Settling Annuities
Q. Mr. Gordon; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *July 23*, 865; *Q.* Mr. A. H. Morton; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *July 26*, 1314.
(*see also* Names of Railways and sub-heading Irrigation and Railway Works).
Rainfall, Total in Affected Districts
Q. Sir M. Bhownaggree; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *July 19*, 466.
(*see also* sub-heading Monsoon.)
Rangoon Outrage—Removal of Colonel Rolland from Command
Q. Sir L. M'Iver; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *July 24*, 1052.
Silver Ornaments, Sale of, at less than their Melting Value
O. Mr. Emmott, *July 26*, 1427.

India—*cont.*
Taxation, *see* sub-heading Finance.
Trade
Explanatory Memorandum—Separate Statistics for Manufactured Articles and Raw Material
Q. Sir M. Bhownaggree; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *July 26*, 1315.
Gold Currency, Effect of on Trade
O. Sir H. Fowler, *July 26*, 1368.
"India, England's Fourth Best Customer"
O. Mr. Souttar, *July 26*, 1315.

India Office
Cost of, Contribution by the Imperial Exchequer
O. Lord Welby, *July 20*, 604—*see also* title India—Finance
Dispute between the Public Offices—Arbitration, etc.
Os. Lord Welby, *July 20*, 604; Earl of Onslow, 606, 607, 614.

Industrial Schools
see Reformatory and Industrial Schools.

Industrial Schools Bill
Petition, *July 27*, 1497.

Inebriate Reformatories
Corngreaves Hall Retreat—Rules as to Management Presented, *July 27*, 1458, 1498.

Inebriates Amendment (Scotland) Bill
c. 2R.* *July 18*, 403.
*Com.** *Rep.** *Con.** and 3R.* *July 19*, 584.
l. Commons Amendts.* *July 20*, 589; *July 24*, 1010.

Inniskilling Fusiliers
Cowshott Manor Camp—Call to Volunteer for Service Abroad, alleged
Qs. Mr. Macaleese; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 19*, 460; *July 23*, 858.

Insurance
Workmen's Compensation Act Extension Bill, *July 16*, 38.

Intermediate Education, Ireland
see Education—Irish Questions.

Intermediate Education (Ireland) Bill
c. 2R., *July 19*, 487.
Com., *July 26*, 1438.

Intermediate Education (Ireland) Bill
Debate on Second Reading and in Committee, *July 19*, 487; *July 26*, 1438.
Board of Education, Constitution, Powers, etc., 490, 498, 503, 506, 513, 517, 519, 521, 1444.

Intermediate Education (Ireland) Bill—*cont.*
Debate on Second Reading and in Committee—*cont.*
Consultative Council associating with Board of Education, suggested, 490, 511, 518.
Defective drafting of the Bill, 495, 497.
Intermediate Education since 1879, Merits and Defects of System, Cramming, etc., 493, 497, 509, 511, 515, 519, 521, 523, 525.
Intermediate Education Act of 1878, 502.
Irish Language, Use of, in Irish Schools, etc., 494, 501, 505, 506, 511, 518, 521, 523, 1439.
Payment by Results, 493, 501, 502, 523.
Prizes, Diminution in, 1440.
Superannuation, 498, 525, 1440, 1441, 1442.
Viceregal Commission Report, etc., 487, 492, 505, 511, 517.

Invasion
Defence of the Empire, *see* that title.

Inver
Water Supply — Delay in Completing Works
Q. Mr. Caldwell; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *July 23*, 877.

Invergordon
Channel Fleet—Proposed Visit
Q. Mr. Caldwell; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *July 23*, 862.

Ipswich Corporation Tramways Bill
c. Reported with Amendts., *July 24*, 1039.

Ireland
Lord Lieutenant—Earl Cadogan.
Lord Chancellor—Lord Ashbourne.
Chief Secretary — Rt. Hon. G. W. Balfour.
Attorney General—Rt. Hon. J. Atkinson.
Solicitor General—Mr. D. P. Barton.
Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture—Rt. Hon. H. C. Plunkett.
Abbeyfeale Children and the Limerick Industrial School Controversy
O. Mr. Austin, *July 20*, 781.
Academy, Royal Irish — Celtic Manuscripts, Grant-in-aid for Salary of Irish Scribe and printing Manuscripts, etc.
Q. Mr. Dillon; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 19*, 479.
Agrarian Outrages—Return Presented, *July 20*, 588, 640.
Agricultural Department—Warble Fly, *see* that sub-heading.

Ireland—*cont.*

Arklow Drift-net Fishing — Fishermen's Petition for Removal of Restrictions
Q. Mr. J. O'Connor ; *A.* Mr. Plunkett, *July 23*, 885.

Army Questions
Contracts
Irish Tenders—Establishment of Depôt in Dublin, proposed
Q. Mr. Field ; *A.* Mr. J. P. Williams, *July 27*, 1508.
Shirt Contracts for Troops in South Africa—Non-acceptance of Tenders from Irish Firms, etc.
Q. Mr. Healy ; *A.* Mr. J. P. Williams, *July 23*, 861.
Recruits—Number in 1899 and 1900
Q. Mr. Shee ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 26*, 1306.
Under-age Recruits—Private Walsh
Q. Mr. Flavin ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 19*, 458.
Weir, Private, Case of, *see* that title.

Bankruptcy Cases—Number closed by Official Assignees in 1899—Return Ordered, *July 17*, 217.

Belfast — *for* collective heading *see* Belfast.

Bills relating to Ireland, *see* their titles.

Blanchfieldboy Postal Arrangements
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 26*, 1333.

Boatmen, Prosecution of, *see* sub-heading Howth.

Boggan Postal Arrangements
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 26*, 1333.

Brehon Laws, Publication of, etc.
Q. Mr. T. D. Sullivan ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 26*, 1337.

Buildings, Surveyor of, *see* sub-heading Surveyors.

Cahir Post Office—New Office
Q. Mr. Mandeville ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 26*, 1332.

Cahirciveen, Erection of Bell Buoy or Perch, proposed — Lighthouse Authority, etc.
Q. Capt. Donelan ; *A.* Mr. Plunkett, *July 23*, 886.

Camden Fort Gun Fatality, *see* title Camden Fort.

Castlebar Post Office—Site for new Office
Q. Dr. R. Ambrose ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 20*, 667.

Carrickmacross Workhouse—Number of Admissions, Tramps, Casuals, etc. —Ratepayers' Grievance
Q. Mr. Daly ; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 26*, 1331.

Cattle, Landing at Port of London Prohibited
Q. Mr. J. O'Connor ; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 16*, 81.

Celtic Language, use of, in Irish Schools in Place of English, *see* Irish Language.

Ireland—*cont.*

Censure to Sutton Railway, *see* sub-heading Sutton.

Census—Irish Language Statistics
Q. Mr. T. D. Sullivan ; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 20*, 660.

Clare, Fishing Industry in West Clare, Development of—Proposed Grant
Q. Major Jameson ; *A.* Mr. Plunkett, *July 24*, 1063.

Clones Level Crossing and Platform—Inspector's Report
Q. Mr. Macaleese ; *A.* Mr. J. Collings, *July 17*, 239.

Clones Water Supply—Complaints against Quality of Water
Q. Mr. Macaleese ; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 26*, 1336.

Coagh Postal Service—Defects
Q. Mr. Doogan ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 26*, 1333.

Constabulary, Royal Irish, *for* collective heading *see* that title.

Convicts, *see* sub-headings, names of Convicts.

Cootehill Postmastership, Appointment of Chemist—Condition attached to previous Appointment
Q. Mr. S. Young ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 19*, 472.

Cork, *see* that title.

Cornalaragh Postal Deliveries—House to house Delivery
Q. Mr. Daly ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 20*, 668.

County Court Acts Administration—Traders' Grievances, Legislation proposed
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien ; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *July 16*, 86.

County Courts (Ireland) Bill—Circulating Draft of Rules, Orders, and Forms
Q. Mr. M. Healy ; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 23*, 878.

Derry, *see* sub-heading Londonderry

Dogs—Muzzling Regulations, *see* that sub-heading

Dromore River Floods—Complaints to the Board of Works and Lough Erne Drainage Board
Q. Mr. Daly ; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 26*, 1331.

Drumconrath Postal Arrangements—Memorial to the Postmaster General
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 26*, 1335.

Dublin, *see* that title.

Dungloe Petty Sessions—Truck Act Prosecution, Case of Mr. O'Donnell
Q. Mr. T. D. Sullivan ; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *July 23*, 882.

Dundoran Mails—Delay in Day Mails from Dublin
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 26*, 1334.

Ireland—*cont.*

Education—*for* collective heading *see* title Education.

Eggs, Importation of Russian Eggs—Exportations to England as Irish Eggs
Qs. Mr. Field, Mr. P. O'Brien; *As.* Mr. Plunkett, *July 20*, 670.

Enniskillen Workhouse—Private Weir, *see* title Weir.

Eviction Notices, Number of—Return Presented, *July 19*, 414, 453.

Finigan, Convict—Remission of Sentence, proposed
Qs. Mr. J. Roche, Mr. Dillon, Mr. S. MacNeill; *As.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 20*, 664.

Fisheries—*for* collective heading, *see* Fisheries.

Fishguard and Rosslare Railways—Carrying out Undertaking Embodied in Agreement
Q. Mr. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 26*, 1338.

Glebe Loans Acts—Profit accruing to the Treasury, Relaxation of Terms of Loans to Borrowers, proposed
Q. Mr. M'Ghee; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 16*, 84.

Greaghlone Letter-box—Neglecting to clear
Q. Mr. Daly; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 20*, 668.

Greeveguilla—Daily Delivery of Letters proposed
Q. Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 16*, 80.

Greystones—Removal of Gravel from Foreshore, etc.
Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 16*, 79.

High Court of Justice, Probate Division—Annual Account of Receipts and Disbursements Presented, *July 19*, 414, 452.

Home Rule—"Killing Home Rule by Kindness"
Os. Mr. Dillon, Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 16*, 174.

Howth Petty Sessions — Prosecution of Boatmen
Qs. Mr. P. O'Brien; *As.* Mr G. W. Balfour, Mr. Hanbury, *July 24*, 1061.

Inniskilling Fusiliers, *see* that title.

Intermediate Education, *see* title Education, Irish Question.

Intermediate Education Board Clerks, Appointment of, etc., under Intermediate Education Bill
Q. Mr. T. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 27*, 1524.

Judicial Statistics, Including Grants for Malicious Injuries in
Q. Mr. T. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 27*, 1521.

Justice, Administration—Refusing Right of Appeal at Monaghan Petty Sessions, *see* title Monaghan.

Ireland—*cont.*

Kilkenny Postal Arrangements
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 26*, 1333.

Kilteevan Drum and Fife Band Demonstration—Police Interference
Q. Mr. Hayden; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 23*, 880.

Labourers' Cottages, Tenants of—District Council Disqualification
Q. Sir W. Foster; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 26*, 1337.

Land Commission—*for* collective heading *see* Land Commission.

Land Purchase under Ashbourne Act and Land Acts, 1892, 1896—Terms of Purchase, Sinking Fund, etc.
Q. Capt. Donelan; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 24*, 1061.

Limavady Postmastership Appointment
Q. Mr. A. J. Moore; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 27*, 1523.

Limerick Telegraph Messengers—Pay
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 26*, 1332.

Liquor Traffic and Liquor Licensing Laws, *see* sub-heading Public House Licences.

Listowel-Ballybunion Railway—Cost
Q. Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 16*, 80.

Listowel to Tarbert Railway—Receiving Deputation with a view to giving Grant
Q. Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 19*, 478.

Loan Fund Board Report, Insufficiency of Powers to Control Operations of Loan Fund Societies — Legislation proposed
Q. Mr. Dillon; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 16*, 83.

Local Government—Return of Rules and Orders, Laying on the Table
Q. Mr. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 20*, 666.

Local Government Returns—Population, Electorate, Poor Law Valuation, etc.
Q. Mr. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 23*, 878.

Local Taxation, *for* collective heading *see* that title.

Local Taxation Fund—Grants-in-aid to Asylums, *see* sub-heading Lunatic Asylums.

Londonderry — Magistracy, Number of Roman Catholics, Protestants, etc.
Q. Mr. A. J. Moore; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 27*, 1520.

Lunatic Asylums, Grants-in-aid—Amount due from the Treasury to the Local Taxation Fund
Q. Sir T. Esmonde; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 27*, 1521.

Lunatic Asylums Board—Supplementary Estimate
Q. Mr. T. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 27*, 1520.

Ireland—*cont.*

Malicious Injuries, Grants for—Including details in future Judicial Statistics
Q. Mr. T. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 27*, 1521.

Mayo Assizes—Contempt of Court, Case of Mr. W. O'Brien
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 20*, 666.

Meath County Council—Staffordshire Bye-Laws
Q. Mr. T. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 26*, 1338.

Militia—Irish Regiments in England, Granting Furlough during Harvest time
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 16*, 66.

Monaghan, *see* that title.

Muldowney, Convict—Remission of Sentence, proposed
Qs. Mr. J. Roche, Mr. Dillon, Mr. S. MacNeill; *As.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 20*, 664.

Muzzling Regulations in Cork
Q. Mr. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. Plunkett, *July 27*, 1522.

National Education, *see* title Education—Irish Questions.

National Gallery—Report Presented, *July 25*, 1162; *July 26*, 1268.

National School Teachers, *see* that title.

Newbliss, *see* that title.

Paupers, Deportation of Irish Paupers—Case of J. Jones
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *July 16*, 78.

Phœnix Park, *see* title Dublin.

Poor Law Schools—Teachers' Income, Direct Grant and Contributory Unions
Qs. Captain Donelan, Mr. M. Healy; *As.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 26*, 1342.

Poor Rate Deductions—Rights of Tenants, Inserting Clause in Local Government (Ireland) Amendment Bill
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *July 26*, 1340.

Post Office Questions, *for* collective heading *see* Post Office—Irish Questions.

Potato Crop—Mr. O'Sullivan's Experiments with Electrical Conductors
Q. Mr. Austin; *A.* Mr. Plunkett, *July 26*, 1340.

Prisoners, *see* sub-heading Names of Prisoners

Public House Licences, New Licences—Annual Return, proposed
Qs. Mr. M. Healy; *As.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 23*, 879; *July 26*, 1337.

Public Records—Report Presented, *July 20*, 588, 640.

Queen's Colleges
Belfast—Report Presented, *July 24*, 988, 1040.

Ireland—*cont.*

Queen's Colleges—*cont.*
Cork—Report for Session 1899-1900 with Appendices, Presented, *July 18*, 342; *July 19*, 414.

Queenstown, Police Landing Regulations—Asking American Passengers for Name and Destination, etc.
Q. Mr. Hayden; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 20*, 666.

Railway Amalgamation Bill—Formation of Tribunal to which Traders and Passengers can Appeal
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 26*, 1339—*see also* titles of Bills.

Railways, *for* collective heading *see* Railways.

Rating
Adjustments—Rate accrued due in past years, Exemption of Landlords, Relieving Occupiers of portion of Rate
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 16*, 82.

Poor Rate, *see* that sub-heading, *also* title Local Taxation.

Rathfriland Postmastership — Appointment of Person Residing in Downpatrick Street
Q. Mr. Rentoul; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 17*, 239.

Reformatory and Industrial Schools
Debate in Committee of Supply
Illegal Committal of Children to Industrial Schools, Chief Secretary's Circular, etc., *July 20*, 771, 777, 780.

The O'Connor Don's Approval of the Circular, *July 20*, 772, 777.

Limerick Industrial School and the Abbeyfeale Children, *July 20*, 781.

Vote for, *July 20*, 771.

Rifle Clubs, Establishment of, proposed—Irish Marksmen at Bisley
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 20*, 665.

Roads—Traction Engines, use of, on Public Roads, *see* sub-heading Traction Engines.

Rossavalley Tenantry—Purchase of Holdings, Interest in Lieu of Rent, etc.
Q. Mr. Doogan; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 26*, 1336.

Royal Irish Academy, *see* sub-heading Academy, Royal Irish.

Royal Irish Constabulary, *see* title Constabulary.

Royal University—Account of Receipts and Expenditure Presented, *July 27*, 1498.

Sands', J., Farm, Police Protection—Number of Police employed, etc.
Q. Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 19*, 478.

Shebeens—Return Presented, *July 23*, 848.

Ireland—*cont.*

Shirt Contracts for the Army, *see* Army Questions.

Sligo and Northern Counties Railway—Running Goods Wagons with Passenger Trains, Delays, etc.
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *July 23*, 882.

Sneem, *see* that title.

South African War—Cost of the War, Amount contributed by Ireland towards Gross Cost
Q. Capt. Donelan; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 23*, 856; *O.* Mr. T. M. Healy, *July 27*, 1637.

Surveyors
Assistant Surveyor of Buildings, Appointment of—Rejection of Mr. Carden, successful Candidate
Q. Sir G. Fardell; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 19*, 475.
County and Assistant County Surveyors devoting whole time to their Duties, etc.
Q. Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 19*, 483.

Sutton-Howth Tramway, *see* that title.

Sutton to Censure Railway, Method of Construction, etc.
Q. Mr. T. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *July 26*, 1339.

Tenancy Contracts, *see* sub-heading Labourers' Cottages.

Tipperary and Limerick Police—Medical Appointment, Neglecting to Consult the wishes of Police
Q. Mr. T. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 19*, 474.

Traction Engines, use of, on Public Roads—Expenditure on Coast Road between Glenarm and Larne, Legislation proposed, etc.
Q. Mr. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 19*, 476.

Trawling—Protection of Irish Fisheries, Naval Gun Boats, etc.
Q. Mr. Power; *A.* Mr. Plunkett, *July 23*, 885.

Truck Act Prosecutions, *see* sub-heading Dungloe Petty Sessions.

Ulster Custom, Case of Lindsay v. Corry
Q. Mr. S. Young; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 17*, 237.

Valentia Harbour—Erection of Perch or Buoy, proposed—Lighthouse Authority, etc.
Q. Capt. Donelan; *A.* Mr. Plunkett, *July 23*, 886.

Volunteers—Formation of Irish Regiments
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 20*, 665.

Warden Estate — National School Teachers' Residence site
Q. Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 20*, 662.

Ireland—*cont.*

Water Gas, use of, in Dublin, *see* title Dublin.

Water Supplies, *see* sub-heading Clones.

Workhouse Dietary Regulations
Q. Capt. Donelan; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 24*, 1059.

Workhouse Schools, *see* sub-heading Poor Law Schools.

Workhouses, *see* sub-heading, Names of Workhouses, and for collective heading *see* title Workhouses.

Irish Education Bill
c. 2R., *July 19*, 526.

Irish Education Bill
Debate on Second Reading, *July 19*, 526.
Board of Education—Commissioners' Power over Funds, etc., 526.
Small Schools—Effect of the Bill on, 527.
Synod of the Church of Ireland—Objections to the Bill, 527.
Teachers, Payment of—Teachers' Power to call upon the Board to show that Consolidated Salary covers present remuneration, 526, 529.

Irish Eggs
Russian Eggs Imported to Ireland—Exportation to England as Irish Eggs
Qs. Mr. Field, Mr. P. O'Brien; *As.* Mr Plunkett, *July 20*, 670.

Irish Language
Census Returns
Q. Mr. T. D. Sullivan; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 20*, 660.

Use of, in Irish Schools
Debate in Com. of Supply, *July 20*, 675—*Division*, Ayes, 70; Noes, 102.
Atkinson, Dr., on, 689.
Bilingual Communities in various parts of Europe, 701.
Bilingual System, Authorities on, 676, 677, 706, 729.
Catholic Bishops of Ireland Resolution, 684.
Chief Secretary's opinion, 680, 686.
Gross, Mr. Edmond, on, 688.
National Teachers Association Resolution, 680.
Number of Children Speaking Irish in Primary Schools, 679, 683.
Number of Children unable to Speak a word of English, 679, 683, 706.
Number of People Speaking Irish Language, 679, 683, 706, 730.
O'Leary, Father, on, 681.
Public Bodies in favour of, 685.

Irish Language—*cont.*
Use of, in Irish Schools—*cont.*
Debate in Com. of Supply—*cont.*
School Managers' Memorial to the Board of Education, 687.
Starkie, Dr., on, 677, 685, 688.
Teaching English through Medium of Irish Language, 684, 686, 701.
Welsh Language, 689.
Proposed Motion for Adjournment of the House
Os. Mr. T. Redmond, Mr. Speaker, *July 16*, 93.
References to in Debate on the Intermediate Education (Ireland) Bill, *July 19*, 494, 501, 505, 506, 511, 518, 521, 523.

Ironclads
Construction of, by British Firms for China—Legislation
Q. Col. Pilkington; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 23*, 853.
(*see also* Navy—Shipbuilding Programme, etc.)

Isle of Man
Teachers' Superannuation—Legislation
Q. Mr. Yoxall; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *July 16*, 71.
Elementary School Teachers' Superannuation (Isle of Man) Bill, *see* that title.

Italy
Trade Report Presented, *July 17*, 192.

Jamaica
Cable Communication—Want of Direct Communication with other West Indian Islands, etc.
Q. Mr. Tomlinson; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *July 19*, 464.
Railway Debentures and the Income Tax—Additional Income Tax Deducted from Dividends Matured before Jan. 24
Q. Mr. Bartley; *A.* Sir M. H. Beach, *July 17*, 231.

James of Hereford, Lord—*Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster*
County and Borough Franchise Assimilation (London) Bill, 2R., *July 17*, 195.
Cruelty to Wild Animals in Captivity Bill, 3R., *July 26*, 1284.

Jameson, Major J. E. [Clare, W.]
Companies Bill, *Com.*, *July 24*, 1132, 1134, 1150, 1155, 1160.
Irish Language, use of in Irish Schools in place of English, *July 20*, 732.
Volunteers Bill, *Com.*, *July 23*, 957, 959.
West Clare Fishing Industry, Development of—Proposed Grant, *July 24*, 1063.

Japan
China—Anti-Foreign Rising, *see* China.

Jarrow and Hebburn Electricity Supply Bill
l. 3R.* *July 16*, 2.
c. Lords Amendts.* *July 20*, 636.

Jeffreys, Mr. A. F. [Hants, N.]
Attendance at School—Bye-laws exempting Children Employed in Agriculture, *July 23*, 868.

Jersey
Elementary School Teachers' Superannuation (Jersey) Bill, *see* that title.
Foreign Men-of-War Manœuvring in and out of Harbours
Qs. Mr. Lambert, Mr. Arnold-Forster; *As.* Mr. Goschen, *July 23*, 863.
Military Garrison—Annual Cost
Q. Mr. Lambert; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 26*, 1305.
Passenger Steamer Service
Q. Mr. Lambert; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *July 26*, 1320.

Johannesburg
see South African War.

Joicey, Sir J. [Durham, Chester-le-Street]
Colonial Stock Bill, 2R., *July 23*, 974.
Companies Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1081, 1088, 1094, 1106.
Military Lands Bill, 2R., *July 23*, 923.

Jones, J.
Irish Pauper—Deportation to Ireland
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *July 16*, 78.

Jones, Mr. D. B. [Swansea District]
Agricultural Holdings Bill, 3R., *July 19*, 550.

Judges
Contempt of Court, Power of Committal, *see* Contempt of Court.

Jurymen
Cork Assizes—Selection of Jurymen
Q. Mr. Flynn; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *July 23*, 884.
Exemption on Account of Deafness—Remuneration for Common Jurymen, etc.
Q. Mr. Billson; *A.* Mr. J. Collings, *July 17*, 235.

Justice, Administration
Ireland—Refusing Right of Appeal, Monaghan Petty Sessions
Q. Mr Macaleese; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 16*, 81.

Kay-Shuttleworth, Right Hon. Sir U. [Lancashire, Clitheroe]
Dublin Corporation Bill, *Con.*, *July 26*, 1291.
Water-tube Boilers on Naval Ships—Committee of Inquiry, etc., *July 17*, 314; *July 26*, 1311.

Kearley, Mr. H. E. [Devonport]
Navy Estimates, Discussion, *July 17*, 336.

Kensington Gardens
Regulations for Closing
Q. Earl Percy; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 27*, 1513.

Kent Artillery Volunteers
Easter Camp Allowances
Q. Sir F. Evans; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 20*, 648.

Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. [Shropshire, Newport]
Agricultural Holdings Bill, 3R., *July 19*, 566.

Kew Gardens
Expenditure since 1890
Q. Mr. T. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 19*, 477

Khartoum
Barracks for
Wyndham's, Mr., Statement, *July 27*, 1533.

Kilkenny
Postal Arrangements—Delivery of Letters in the Townlands of Boggan and Blanchfieldboy
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 26*, 1333.

Kilteevan
Drum and Fife Band Demonstrations—Police Interference
Q. Mr. Hayden; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 23*, 880.

Kilworth
Rifle Range—Acquisition of Adjoining Land
Q. Mr. M. Healy; *A.* Mr J. P. Williams, *July 23*, 880.

Kimber, Mr. H. [Wandsworth]
Johannesburg, Resumption of Industrial Occupations, *July 27*, 1500.
South African War
British Medical Comforts for the Boers — Treatment of British Prisoners, *July 27*, 1502.
Lindley Disaster
Inquiry into Surrender of Troops, etc., *July 27*, 1501.
Treatment of Prisoners by the Boers, *July 27*, 1609.

Kimberley, Earl of
Agricultural Holdings Bill, *Com.*, *July 27*, 1484.
China — Anti-Foreign Rising, Papers, *July 23*, 796.
Education Bill, 2R., *July 23*, 823, 828, 830, 831, 832.
Indian Expenditure—Report of Royal Commission, *July 20*, 610.
Merchant Shipping (Liability of Shipowners and Others) Bill, 3R., *July 20*, 620; *July 26*, 1273,
Poor Removal Bill, 3R., *July 19*, 418, 419.
Reading Clerkship Vacancy, Appointment of Legal Assistant, etc., *July 24*, 1016. 1023.
Strength and Organisation of Home Defences, *July 27*, 1475.
Tithe Rent-charge (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *July 19*, 425.

Kingscourt, Keady and Armagh Railway Bill
l. Report from Committee of Selection *July 16*, 3; *July 17*, 191.
Report from Select Committee and Bill committed, *July 19*, 411.
Reported with Amendts., *July 20*, 586.

Kinnaird, Lord
Indian Irrigation Works, Expenditure on, etc., *July 23*, 834.

Koornspruit Disaster
see South African War.

"Kowshing"
Loss of, Claims—Arbitration
Q. Sir M. Stewart; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *July 26*, 1315.

Kumassi
see Ashanti—Coomassie

Laboratory
Marine Biological Association, *see* that title.

Labouchere, Mr. H. [Northampton]
Business of the House—Abandonment of Bills, Discussion in Com. of Supply, etc., *July 16*, 108.
Companies Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1071, 1100, 1117, 1119, 1120.
Palace of Westminster, Works Department—Employees' Holiday Grievance, *July 16*, 76.
Postmen—Straw Hats for, *July 26*, 1326.
South African War—Attack on Sir A. Milner and Mr. J. Chamberlain, Settlement after the War, Punishment of Rebels, etc., *July 25*, 1219.

Labour
Armstrong, Whitworth, and Co.'s, Messrs., Manchester Works—Joiners' Wages, Breach of Fair Wages Resolution, etc.
Q. Mr. Woods; *A.* Mr. J. P. Williams, *July 26*, 1308.
Great Eastern Railway Dispute, *see* that title.
Wages—Local Authorities Contracts, Return Presented, *July 24*, 1040.

Labourers' Cottages, Ireland
Tenants of—District Council Disqualification, Test case
Q. Sir W. Foster; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 26*, 1337.

Ladysmith
see South African War.

Lambert, Mr. G. [Devon, South Molton]
Agricultural Holdings Bill, 3R., *July 19*, 538.
Food Preservatives
Date of Issue of Departmental Committee Report, etc., *July 26*, 1316, 1317.
Postponement of Prosecutions, *July 27*, 1517.
Jersey
Foreign Men-of-War Manœuvring, in and out of Harbours, *July 23*, 863.
Military Garrison—Annual Cost, *July 26*, 1305.
Local Taxation—Report of Royal Commission, *July 23*, 887.
Prison-made Goods Act — Seizures of Foreign Goods, *July 23*, 872.
South African War—Transport Officers, Rewards and Distinctions, *July 23*, 857.

Lambeth
Pauper Children, Establishment of Receiving Home—Local Government Board suggestion
Q. Mr. Flower; *A.* Mr. Chaplin, *July 24*, 1053.

Lambeth Water Bill
l. 3R.* *July 17*, 190.
c. Lords Amendts.* *July 23*, 845.

Lancashire, Derbyshire, and East Coast Railway Bill
l. 3R.* *July 17*, 189.
c. Lords Amendts.* *July 23*, 845.

Lancashire Electric Power Bill
*c. Con.** and 3R.* *July 16*, 53.
l. 1R.* *July 16*, 3.
2R.* *July 20*, 586.
Committed, *July 23*, 786.
Report from Committee of Selection, *July 23*, 788; *July 24*, 987.
Report from Select Committee, *July 27*, 1449.
Standing Orders, *July 19*, 409.

Lancashire Volunteer Regiments
Engineer Corps, Formation of, proposed
Qs. Sir J. W. Maclure; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 20*, 649; *July 26*, 1305.
Travelling Expenses — Supplementary Grant, etc.
Q. Lord Balcarres; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 23*, 860.

Lancaster Corporation Bill
l. Reported with Amendts., *July 23*, 786.

Lancaster, Duchy of
Chancellor—Rt. Hon. Lord James of Hereford.

Lance Exhibition
Cartwright's, Sergeant, Performance — Claim
Q. Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. J. P. Williams, *July 16*, 67.

Land
Military Lands, *see* that title.

Land Acts, Ireland
Ashbourne Act and Land Acts, 1892, 1896, Purchases under—Terms of Purchase, Sinking Fund, etc.
Q. Captain Donelan; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 24*, 1061.

Land Charges Bill
l. Commons Amendts.* *July 19*, 435.

Land Commission, Ireland
Advances under Act of 1891—Return Presented, *July 27*, 1458, 1498.
Belfast—Increases of Rent, Mr. Commissioner O'Brien's Statement, etc.
Q. Mr. S. Young; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 16*, 82.
Cork Sittings
Delay in hearing Fair Rent Appeals
Q. Mr. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 24*, 1062.
Place of next Sitting, Number of Cases Unheard, etc.
Q. Dr. Tanner; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 27*, 1522.
Dublin—Ulster Custom, Case of Lindsay *v.* Corry
Q. Mr. S. Young; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 17*, 237.

Land Law (Ireland) Act
Eviction Notices, Number of—Return Presented, *July 19*, 414, 453.

Land Question
India, *see* India—Land.

Land Registry
Accounts of Receipts and Payments Presented, *July 19*, 414, 452.

Land Revenue, India
see India.

Land Revenue Records
Rules as to Inspection by the Public
Q. Mr. Woods; *A.* Sir R. Finlay, *July 26*, 1323.

Languages
Bilingual System of Instruction
Debate in Com. of Supply, *July 20*, 675.
Irish Language, *see* that title.

Lansdowne, Marquess of—*Secretary of State for War*
Attack on, *see* War Office—Administration.
Australian Reserve Forces, Proposed Enrolment of Colonial Naval Reserve, etc., *July 19*, 441.
Horses—Supply of Remounts, Lesson of the South African War, etc., *July 17*, 206.
Members of Local Authorities Relief Bill, *Com.*, *July 16*, 36.
Militia — Re-organisation, Regulations with reference to Volunteering for Foreign Service, etc., *July 26*, 1286.
Reorganisation of the Army and Reconstruction of the War Office, *July 17*, 199, 206.
South African War
Hospital and Medical Arrangements —Committee of Inquiry, *July 19*, 449.
Medals—Colonial Troops, Separate Medal rumour, *July 26*, 1289.
Strength and Organisation of Home Defences, *July 27*, 1472.
Tents, Supply of, etc., *July 17*, 206.

Laundry Prosecution
Sheffield—War Office Contract with Laundry
Q. Mr. Tennant; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *July 23*, 875.

Laurie, Gen. J. W. [Pembroke and Haverfordwest]
Army Promotion Board—Constitution and Functions, *July 26*, 1307, 1308.

Law Courts
see High Court of Justice.

Lawlessness in the Church
see Ritualism.

Lawrence, Mr. W. F. [Liverpool, Abercromby]
Niger Coast Protectorate—Spirit Import Duties, *July 23*, 867.
Pauper Children—Regulation against Boarding out Defective and Epileptic Children in same home with Pauper Children, *July 17*, 236.

Lawson, Sir W. [Cumberland, Cockermouth]
South African War
Boer Women, Expulsion of, from Pretoria, *July 24*, 1044.
Martial Law, Arrest of Mr. J. Botha in Cape Colony, *July 16*, 63.
Protest Against the Policy of the Government, etc., *July 25*, 1172.

Lea, Sir T. [Londonderry, S.]
Companies Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1080, 1130.

Lecky, Rt. Hon. W. E. H. [Dublin University]
Intermediate Education (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *July 19*, 501.
Irish Education Bill, 2R., *July 19*, 531.

Lee Conservancy Bill
c. Lords Amendts.* *July 16*, 53.

Leicesters
Volunteer Battalion, 1st—Insufficient Supply of Rifles
Q. Major Rasch; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 24*, 1048.

Leighton, Mr. S. [Shropshire, Oswestry]
Business of the House—Diocesan Records Bill, *July 16*, 98.

Letter Pillar Boxes
Metropolis—Number in East Central District, Number divided into two Compartments, etc.
Q. Mr. Cohen; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 16*, 75.

Letters
Excess Charge on Unstamped Letters—Number of Charges, etc.
Q. Mr. Duckworth; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 23*, 871.
(*see also* Post Office.)

Level Crossings
Clones—Report of Inspector
Q. Mr. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. J. Collings, *July 17*, 239.

Lewis, Island of
Insanitary Condition—Erection of Isolation Hospitals, Enforcing Provisions of Public Health Act, etc.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *July 16*, 77.
Road between Cromore and Graver—Delay in Construction
Q. Mr. Caldwell; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *July 23*, 876.

Lewis, Mr. J. H. [Flint Boroughs]
Agricultural Holdings Bill, 3R., *July 19*, 577.

Lewis, Mr. J. H.—*cont.*
Irish Language, Use of, in National Schools in place of English, *July 20*, 712.
Military Lands Bill, 2R., *July 23*, 907.
Public Works Loans Bill, *Com.*, *July 23*, 980.
Tithe Rent-charge (Ireland) Bill, 3R., *July 16*, 126; *Re-com.*, *July 16*, 139.

Liberal Party Leadership
South African War and the Liberal Party —Sir C. Reid's Declaration and Mr. Balfour's Comments, *July 25*, 1243.

Libraries
Public Libraries Bill, *see* that title.

Licensed Premises (Hours of Sale) (Scotland) Bill
Petition, *July 25*, 1162.

Light Railways
Orders Presented, *July 20*, 588, 639.
(*see also* titles of Bills.)

Limavady
Postmastership Appointment
Q. Mr. A. J. Moore; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 27*, 1523.

Limerick
Constabulary — Medical Appointments Neglecting to consult wishes of the Police
Q. Mr. T. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 19*, 474.
Industrial School—Case of the Abbeyfeale Children
O. Mr. Austin, *July 20*, 781.
Telegraph Messengers — Payment for Messages delivered
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 26*, 1332.

Lindley Disaster
see South African War.

Lindsay v. Corry
Dublin Land Commission—Ulster Custom, Judge's Decision, etc.
Q. Mr. S. Young; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour *July 17*, 237.

Liquor Traffic and Liquor Licensing Laws
Niger Coast Protectorate—Amount of Spirits Imported in 1898 and 1899, Duties paid on Stocks by Native Traders, etc.
Q. Mr. Lawrence; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *July 23*, 867.
Public House Licences, Ireland, New Licences, etc.—Annual Return
Qs. Mr. M. Healy; *As.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 23*, 879; *July 26*, 1337.

Liquor Traffic and Liquor Licensing Laws—*cont.*
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday Bill, and Sunday Closing (Monmouthshire) Bill, *see* those titles.
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children Bills, *see* their titles.
Shebeens, Ireland — Return Presented, *July 23*, 848.

Liquor Traffic Local Veto (Scotland) Bill
Bill Withdrawn, *July 23*, 888.

Listowel
Police Protection of J. Sands' Farm—Number of Police Employed, Cost, etc.
Q. Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 19*, 478.
Railway to Ballybunion—Cost
Q. Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 16*, 80.
Railway to Tarbert—Receiving Deputation with a view to giving Grant
Q. Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 19*, 478.

Liverpool
Naval Recruiting — Further Facilities proposed
Q. Mr. C. M'Arthur; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *July 24*, 1049.
Postal Staff Promotion of Clerk to be Superintendent — Placing Postal and Telegraphic Branches on an Equality
Q. Mr. Steadman; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 20*, 655.
Telegraphists—Promotion of No. 34 on the Seniority List
Q. Mr. M'Ghee; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 17*, 233.

Liverpool Corporation Bill
l. 3R.* *July 27*, 1450.

Liverpool Overhead Railway Bill
*c. Con.** *July 20*, 636.
3R.* *July 25*, 1161.
l. Commons Amendts.* *July 26*, 1267.

Lloyd-George, Mr. D. [Carnarvon, etc.]
Agricultural Holdings Bill, 3R., *July 19*, 569.
Business of the House, Winding-up the Business of the Session—Private Members' Grievance, etc., *July 16*, 105.
South African War
Attack on Mr. Chamberlain, *July 25*, 1199.
British Forces, Reinforcements—Statistics, *July 20*, 646.
British Prisoners at Pretoria—Treatment, *July 20*, 646.

Loan Fund Board, Ireland
Report—Powers not sufficient to control Operations of Loan Fund Societies —Legislation
Q. Mr. Dillon; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 16*, 83.

Loans
Glebe Loans Acts, *see* that title.
Public Works Loans Board, *see* that title.

Local Authorities
Contracts—Conditions, Wages, etc., Return Presented, *July 24*, 1040.
Members of, at the Front, Loss of Office, etc.—Members of Local Authorities Relief Bill, *see* that title.

Local Government Act (1888) Amendment (London) Bill
c. 1R.* *July 17*, 241.

Local Government Board
President—Rt. Hon. H. Chaplin.
Parliamentary Secretary—Mr. T W. Russell.
Dorking—Supplying *Dorking Advertiser* with Letter addressed to Rural District Council
Q. Mr. Cubitt; *A.* Mr. Chaplin, *July 16*, 73.

Local Government, Ireland
Rate Adjustments—Rate accrued due in past years, Exemption of Landlords —Relieving Occupiers of Portion of Rate
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 16*, 82.
Return of Rules and Orders—Laying on the Table
Q. Mr. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 20*, 666.
Returns — Population, Electorate, Poor Law Valuation, etc.
Q. Mr. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 23*, 878.

Local Government (Ireland) Bill
c. 2R.* *July 26*, 1448.

Local Government (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill
c. 2R.* *July 26*, 1448.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill
*l. Com.** *July 16*, 4.
Reported with Amendts., *July 17*, 191.
3R.* *July 19*, 412.
c. Lords Amendts.* *July 23*, 846.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill
*l. Com.** and *Rep.** *July 16*, 4.
3R.* *July 17*, 191.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill
l. Com. and *Rep.** *July 26*, 1268.
3R.* *July 27*, 1457.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill
l. 2R.* *July 16*, 5.
Committed, *July 16*, 7.
Report from Committee of Selection, *July 19*, 413.
Committed to Committee of the whole House, *July 23*, 786.
*Com.** and *Rep.** *July 27*, 1457.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill
*l. Com.** and *Rep.** *July 16*, 5.
3R.* *July 17*, 191.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill
l. 2R* *July 16*, 5.
Committed, *July 16*, 7.
Report from Committee of Selection, *July 19*, 413; *July 23*, 788.
Reported without Amendt., *July 24*, 985.
*Com.** and *Rep.** *July 26*, 1268.
3R.* *July 27*, 1457.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill
l. 2R.* *July 16*, 5.
Committed to a Committee of the whole House, *July 16*, 7.
*Com.** and *Rep.** *July 17*, 190.
3R.* *July 19*, 412.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill
l. 2R.* *July 16*, 5.
Committed to a Committee of the whole House, *July 16*, 7.
*Com.** and *Rep.** *July 17*, 190.
3R.* *July 19*, 412.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill
l. 2R.* *July 16*, 5.
Committed to a Committee of the whole House, *July 17*, 190.
*Com.** and *Rep.** *July 26*, 1268.
3R.* *July 27*, 1457.
Standing Orders, *July 16*, 1.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 13) Bill
l. 2R.* *July 16*, 5.
Committed to a Committee of the whole House, *July 16*, 7.
*Com.** and *Rep.** *July 17*, 190.
3R.* *July 19*, 412.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 14) Bill
l. 2R.* *July 16*, 6.
Committed, *July 17*, 190.
Report from Committee of Selection *July 19*, 413 ; *July 23*, 788.
Reported without Amendt.* *July 24*, 985.
*Com.** and *Rep. July 26*, 1268.
3R.* *July 27*, 1457.
Standing Orders, *July 16*, 1.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 15) Bill
l. 2R.* *July 16*, 6.
Committed to a Committee of the whole House, *July 16*, 7.
*Com.** *July 27*, 1457.

Local Government Provisional Order (Housing of the Working Classes) Bill
l. 2R.* *July 16*, 6.
Committed to a Committee of the whole House, *July 16*, 7.
*Com.** and *Rep.** *July 17*, 190.
3R.* *July 19*, 412.

Local Government Provisional Order (Housing of the Working Classes) (No. 2) Bill
*l. Com.** and *Rep.** *July 19*, 413.

Local Government Provisional Orders (Ireland) (No. 3) Bill
l. 2R.* *July 16*, 6.
*Com.** and *Rep.** *July 19*, 412.
3R.* *July 20*, 587.

Local Government Provisional Orders (Ireland) (No. 4) Bill
l. 2R.* *July 16*, 6.
*Com.** *July 24*, 987.
Reported with Amendts., *July 26*, 1268.
3R.* *July 27*, 1457.

Local Government Provisional Orders (Ireland) (Housing of Working Classes) Bill
l. 2R.* *July 16*, 6.
*Com.** and *Rep.** *July 19*, 412.
3R.* *July 20*, 587.

Local Government Provisional Orders (Ireland) (Housing of Working Classes (No. 2) Bill
l. 2R.* *July 16*, 6.
*Com.** *July 19*, 412.
3R.* *July 20*, 587.

Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) Bill
*l. Com.** and *Rep.** *July 16*, 5.
3R.* *July 17*, 191.

Local Government Provisional Orders Bills
Suspension of Standing Orders, *July 16*, 5.

Local Taxation
Didsbury Voluntary School Rate, Applying for, on same Demand Note as Poor and General District Rate, etc.
Q. Mr. C. Williams ; *A.* Mr. Chaplin, *July 26*, 1317.
Equalisation of Rates Act — Accounts under Section I, etc.—Return Ordered, *July 26*, 1298.
Ireland
Belfast Rates—Public Health Charge, Liability of Occupiers
Q. Mr. Macaleese ; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *July 16*, 84.
Dublin Rates, Equalisation of, etc.—Recommendations of Joint Committee on Dublin Corporation Bill, etc.
Q. Mr. T. M. Healy ; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 23*, 886.
Poor Rate Deductions
Q. Mr. Field ; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *July 26*, 1340.
Rate Adjustments, Rate accrued due in past years—Exemption of Landlords, Relieving Occupiers of portion of Rate
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill ; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 16*, 82.
Returns Presented, *July 18*, 343 ; *July 19*, 414.
Report of Royal Commission
Q. Mr. Lambert ; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 23*, 887.
Returns, Delay in Printing and Circulating
Q. Mr. Channing ; *A.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *July 27*, 1514.

Local Taxation Fund
Grants-in-aid to Irish Lunatic Asylums—Amount due from the Treasury
Q. Sir T. Esmonde ; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 27*, 1521.

Lockhart, Sir W.
Death of
O. Lord G. Hamilton, *July 26*, 1364.

Lodgers' Franchise
County and Borough Franchise Assimilation (London) Bill, *July 17*, 194, 195.

London
City of London—Finances of the Corporation, Chamberlain's Report, *July 27*, 1458, 1498.
Sentry Duty—Number of Men detailed for Guards and Sentry-go, etc.
Q. Major Rasch ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 19*, 462.

London (Clerkenwell and Holborn) Provisional Order Bill
*l. Com.** and *Rep.** *July 17*, 191.
3R.* *July 19*, 413.

London County Council
Piccadilly, Widening—Obtaining Strip of Green Park, etc.
Qs. Mr. Coghill, Mr. G. Bowles; *As.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 24*, 1059.

London County Council (General Powers) Bill
l. Reported with Amendts., *July 27*, 1449.

London County Council (Money) Bill
l. Reported with Amendts., *July 20*, 586.
3R.* *July 24*, 986.

London County Tramways (No. 1) Bill
l. Report from Committee of Selection, *July 16*, 3; *July 17*, 192.

London County Tramways (No. 2) Bill
l. Report from Committee of Selection, *July 16*, 3; *July 17*, 191.
Report from Select Committee with Amendts., *July 24*, 985.

London (Equalisation of Rates) Act, 1894
Accounts under Section I. (7)—Return Ordered, *July 26*, 1298.

London (Poplar) Provisional Order Bill
*l. Com.** and *Rep.** *July 17*, 191.
3R.* *July 19*, 413.

London (St. Luke) Provisional Order Bill
l. 2R.* *July 19*, 412.
*Com.** and *Rep.** *July 20*, 587.
3R.* *July 23*, 788.
Standing Orders, *July 17*, 189.

London (St. Marylebone) Provisional Order Bill
l. 1R.* *July 16*, 5.
2R.* *July 24*, 987.
Standing Orders, *July 20*, 585.

London School Board
Application for Recognition as Higher Elementary Schools, etc.
Q. Mr. Lough; *A.* Sir J. Gorst, *July 27*, 1516.
Audit Case—Delay in Submitting to Queen's Bench
Q. Mr. E. Cecil; *A.* Sir J. Gorst, *July 23*, 870.
Rehousing Schemes—Proposed Erection of Dwellings in Parnell Road, Bow, etc.
Q. Mr. Pickersgill; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *July 16*, 73.
Science and Art Instruction—Duplicate Registration of Attendance
Q. Mr. E. Cecil; *A.* Sir J. Gorst, *July 24*, 1057.

London Sea Water Supply Bill
*c. Con.** *July 16*, 53.
3R.* *July 19*, 450.
l. Commons Amendts.* *July 20*, 586; *July 26*, 1265.

London (Southwark) Provisional Order Bill
l. 2R.* *July 19*, 412.
*Com.** and *Rep.** *July 20*, 587.
3R.* *July 23*, 788.
Standing Orders, *July 17*, 189.

London United Tramways Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *July 20*, 585.

London, Walthamstow, and Epping Forest Railway Bill.
Bill Withdrawn, *July 19*, 450.

London, Walthamstow, and Epping Forest Railway (Abandonment) Bill
c. Reported without Amendt., *July 18*, 341.
Examiner's Certificates Referred to Standing Orders Committee, *July 19*, 409.
*Con.** and 3R.* *July 23*, 845.
l. 1R.* *July 23*, 787.
2R.* *July 27*, 1449.
Standing Orders, *July 23*, 785; *July 26*, 1265.

London Water Supply
see Water Supply.

London and North Western Railway Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *July 20*, 585.
3R.* *July 24*, 986.

London and North Western Railway (Wales) Bill
l. Report from Select Committee and Bill Committed, *July 17*, 189.
Reported with Amendts., *July 19*, 409.
3R.* *July 24*, 986.

London and San Francisco Bank Bill
c. Reported without Amendts., *July 17*, 216.
3R.* *July 20*, 636.

London and South Western Railway Bill
l. Reported with Amendts., *July 19*, 409.
3R.* *July 23*, 786.
c. Lords Amendts.* *July 27*, 1495.

Londonderry, Marquess of — *Postmaster General*
Post Office Sites Bill, 2R., *July 27*, 1478.
Tithe Rent-charge (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *July 19*, 432.

Long, Col.
Tugela Engagement, *see* South African War.

Long, Col. C. W. [Worcestershire, Evesham]
Companies Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1068.

Lord Advocate
Rt. Hon. A. G. Murray.

Lord Chancellor
Earl of Halsbury.

Lord Chancellor of Ireland
Lord Ashbourne.

Lord Lieutenant of Ireland
Earl Cadogan.

Lord Privy Seal
Viscount Cross.

Lough, Mr. T. [Islington, W.]
Companies Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1125, 1131, 1136, 1142, 1156.
Imitation of County Court Process Bill, 2R., *July 23*, 976.
London School Board—Application for Recognition as Higher Elementary Schools, etc., *July 27*, 1516.

Lowe, Mr. F. W. [Birmingham, Edgbaston]
Companies Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1156.

Lowles, Mr. J. [Shoreditch, Haggerston]
Colonial Stock Bill, 2R. *July 23*, 974.

Lowther, Rt. Hon. J. W.—*Chairman of Committees* [Cumberland, Penrith]
Amendment out of Order—Amendment to impose fresh Charge upon the Taxpayer, *July 23*, 965.
Amendments—Moving Amendment before Clause had been read a Second Time, *July 16*, 138.
Irrelevant Observations, *July 16*, 136; *July 23*, 936, 942, 943, 953, 957.

Luggage
Excess Charges
Laying Correspondence on the Table
Q. Mr. Trevelyan; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *July 20*, 653.
Free Luggage—Increased Scale allowed by Midland Company, etc.
Qs. Sir. C. Gull, Mr. Trevelyan; *As.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 16*, 74.

Lunacy Bill
Bill Withdrawn, *July 16*, 188.
O. Mr. Pickersgill, *July 16*, 98.

Lunacy Board (Scotland) (Salaries, etc.) Bill
*c. Com.** and *Rep.** *July 18*, 402.
Con. and 3R.* *July 19*, 583.
l. 1R.* *July 20*, 589.
2R. *July 24*, 1010.
*Com.** and *Rep.** *July 26*, 1284.

Lunatic Asylums
Ireland
Grants-in-Aid—Amount due from the Treasury to the Local Taxation Fund
Q. Sir T. Esmonde; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 27*, 1521.
Lunatic Asylums Board—Supplementary Estimate
Q. Mr. T. M. Healy; *A.* Sir M. H. Beach, *July 27*, 1520.
Monaghan Asylum Works
Qs. Mr. Daly; *As.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 19*, 480; *July 20*, 660.

Lurgan, Lord
Shannon Water and Electric Power Bill, 2R., *July 23*, 790.

Lyddite Shells
Picric Acid, Plant for the Manufacture—Sufficient to meet strain of Naval War, etc.
Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 17*, 226.
O. Sir C. Dilke, *July 17*, 336.

Macaleese, Mr. D. [Monaghan, N.]
Belfast Rates—Public Health Charge, Liability of Occupiers, *July 16*, 84.
Clones Level Crossing and Platform—Inspector's Report, *July 17*, 239.
Inniskilling Fusiliers, 3rd, at Cowshott Manor Camp—Call to Volunteer for Service in South Africa, *July 19*, 460; *July 23*, 858.
Irish National School Teachers' Income—Memorandum as to Provisional Payments, etc., *July 26*, 1341.
Monaghan Petty Sessions—Right of Appeal denied to M'Guigan and Hughes, Mitigation of Sentence, proposed, *July 16*, 81.
Newbliss
Delivery of Telegrams by Girls, *July 27*, 1523.
Postman attending Orange Demonstration at Clones, *July 24*, 1063.
Post Office—Late Postmistress Residing in Post Office, etc., *July 19*, 473.
Traction Engines on Public Roads, etc., *July 19*, 476.

M'Arthur, Mr. C. [Liverpool, Exchange]
Mersey, Placing Port Guardship in, proposed—Recruiting at Liverpool, etc., *July 24*, 1049.

Macartney, Mr. W. E. [Antrim, S.]
China, Anti-Foreign Rising — British Marine Guards, Names of Officers and Men, *July 19*, 454.
Coal Emergency Contracts
Alteration of Conditions, *July 17*, 227.
Manœuvres, Separate Contracts for — Coal Supply for South Africa and China, *July 20*, 650.

Macartney, Mr. W. E.—*cont.*
Gas Order Confirmation (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *July 17*, 214.
Naval Reserve Bill, 2R., *July 23*, 967; *Com.*, *July 26*, 1446.
Stores—Reserve of Warlike Stores, etc., *July 17*, 337.
Transport Service
"Custodian," Complaints against Provisions, etc., during Voyage from Capetown, *July 19*, 457.
Delay in issue of Return, *July 16*, 62.
Water-tube Boilers — Expenditure on Belleville Boilers since 1895, *July 19*, 463.

McDermott, Mr. P. [Kilkenny, N.]
National School Teachers, Ireland—Result Fees, Payment of Arrears, etc., *July 23*, 879.

M'Ghee, Mr. R. [Louth, S.]
Dukinfield Postmastership—Number of Applicants, *July 17*, 233.
Glebe Loans Acts—Relaxation of Terms of Loans, *July 16*, 84.
Liverpool Telegraphists — Promotion of No. 34 on the Seniority List, *July 17*, 233.

M'Guigan, Case of
Monaghan Petty Sessions — Right of Appeal Refused, etc.
Q. Mr. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 16*, 81.

MacIver, Mr. D. [Liverpool, Kirkdale]
Water-tube Boilers
Belleville Boilers on Merchant Ships, *July 17*, 229.
Naval Ships, *July 17*, 330.

McIver, Sir L. [Edinburgh, W.]
Rangoon Outrage — Removal of Col. Rolland from Command, *July 24*, 1052.

M'Laren, Mr. C. B. B. [Leicester, Bosworth]
Companies Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1077.

Maclean, Mr. J. M. [Cardiff]
China, Anti-Foreign Rising — Peking Legations, Measures adopted for Protection of, etc., *July 16*, 59.
Income Tax—Bank of England deducting increased Rate of Income Tax from Interest Warrants maturing on or about July 1st, *July 17*, 231.
India
British and Native Troops, Total Number withdrawn for Service in China, etc., *July 17*, 218.
Budget—Famine, Imperial Grant, etc., *July 26*, 1387.
South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Bill, *Con.*, *July 16*, 41.

Maclure, Sir J. W. [Lancashire, Stretford]
Lancashire—Volunteer Engineer Corps for South East Lancashire, Formation of, *July 20*, 649; *July 26*, 1305.

MacNeill, Mr. S. [Donegal, S.]
Army
Promotion Board, Constitution and Functions of, *July 26*, 1308; *July 27*, 1506.
Reserve Medical Officers—Promotion Regulations, *July 20*, 647.
Constabulary, Royal Irish—Appointment of Col. N. Chamberlain as Inspector General, *July 17*, 238.
Contempt of Court—Judges' Power of Committal, Legislation proposed, *July 23*, 887.
Dundoran Mails, Delay in Day Mails from Dublin, *July 26*, 1334.
Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, Intro. *July 23*, 889.
Indian Army—British and Native Troops for China—Cost, *July 17*, 219; *July 19*, 455.
Irish Convicts—Muldowney and Finigan, Remission of Sentence, *July 20*, 665.
Irish Language, use of, in Irish Schools in Place of English, *July 20*, 730.
Mayo Assizes—Contempt of Court, Case of Mr. W. O'Brien, etc., *July 20*, 666.
Rate Adjustments—Rate accrued due in past years, Exemption of Landlords, etc., *July 16*, 82.
Sligo and Northern Counties Railway—Goods Wagons Running with Passenger Trains, Delays, etc., *July 23*, 882.
South African War
Answers to Question — "Splendid Evasion," *July 27*, 1630.
British Casualties in June, *July 27*, 1501.
British Forces, Reinforcements — Statistics, *July 20*, 646.
Casualties, Delay in publishing — Case of Sergeant French and Private Martin, *July 16*, 66.
Civil Surgeons, Number Employed, *July 16*, 64.
Despatches, Non-publication of, etc., *July 16*, 62; *July 27*, 1631.
Discharged Soldiers, Treatment of—Case of Private Weir, *July 16*, 65.
Enteric Fever, Inoculation against—Statement of Director General of Army Medical Department, *July 24*, 1046.
Hospital and Medical Arrangements —Commission of Inquiry
Constitution of Commission—Opportunity for Discussion, *July 17*, 223.

MacNeill, Mr. S.—*cont.*
South African War—*cont.*
Hospital and Medical Arrangements—Commission of Inquiry—*cont.*
Cunningham, Professor, Appointment of, *July 16*, 61.
Harrison, Mr., Appointment of—Member of Army Railway Council, *July 23*, 855.
Powers to enforce attendance of Witnesses, etc., *July 24*, 1042.
Warrant of Prime Minister—Statutory Commission, *July 26*, 1299, 1300.
Invalided Officers and Men—Number invalided Home, Number of Deaths, etc., *July 19*, 460.
Johannesburg—Court of Chief Magistrate Tribunal, etc. *July 19*, 461.
Koornspruit Disaster, Officer Responsible for failure to Communicate with Col. Broadwood, *July 27*, 1500.
Royal Irish Rifles—Command, *July 27*, 1503.
Surrender of British Troops, etc.—Courts of Inquiry, *July 27*, 1504.
Tugela Engagement — Non-publication of Col. Long's Explanation, *July 20*, 645.
Tithe Rent-charge (Ireland) Bill, *Re-com.*, *July 16*, 142; 3R., *July 16*, 119, 175.
War Office—"Hot-bed of Favouritism," *July 27*, 1630.

Machinery
Naval Shipbuilding—Mr. Goschen's Statement, *July 17*, 241.

Madagascar
French Import Duties, Increase of—Infraction of British Trade Rights, Reply to Representations
Q. Mr. D. A. Thomas; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *July 19*, 463.

Maddison, Mr. F. [Sheffield, Brightside]
Companies Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1069.
Indian Budget—Imperial Grant in aid of the Famine, etc., *July 26*, 1435.
South African War—Number of men in Hospital from causes other than Wounds, *July 23*, 858.
Volunteers Bill, *Com.*, *July 23*, 939, 956.

Magistrates and Justices of the Peace
Bail Regulations, *see* that title.
Derry Magistrates, *see* Londonderry.

Mails
Australian Mails—Delay in transit from Naples to London, Liability of Continental Railway Companies, etc.
Q. Mr. Hogan; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 16*, 70.
Devon, North — Night Mail Service Delays, Improvement of Train Service, etc.
Q. Sir C. Gull; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 20*, 657.

Mails—*cont.*
Dundoran—Delay in Day Mails from Dublin
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 26*, 1334.
India and Australia, Delay in Despatch of Mails to
Q. Mr. Hogan; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 16*, 69.

Malicious Injuries
Ireland — Grants, including in Future Judicial Statistics
Q. Mr. T. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 27*, 1521.

Malta
Dock Accommodation for Naval Ships—New Works
Os. Viscount Sidmouth, Earl of Hopetoun, Earl Spencer, *July 17*, 207.

Manchester
Armstrong, Whitworth, and Co., Messrs., Works—Joiners' Wages, Breach of Fair Wages Resolution, etc.
Q. Mr. Woods; *A.* Mr. J. P. Williams, *July 26*, 1308.

Manchester, Bishop of
Educational Grants—Differential Treatment in Urban and Rural Schools, *July 24*, 1028.

Manchester Corporation Tramways Bill
c. Reported with Amendts., *July 27*, 1496.

Mandeville, Mr. [Tipperary, S.]
Cahir Post Office, *July 26*, 1332.

Manœuvres
Naval Manœuvres of 1899, *see* Navy—Boilers, etc.

Manuscripts
Celtic Manuscripts, *see* that title.
Historical Manuscripts Commission, *see* that title.

Maps
Geological Survey Maps, Limited Sale of, etc.
Q. Mr. Hazell; *A.* Sir J. Gorst, *July 23*, 869.

Margate Pier and Harbour Bill
*c. Con.** *July 17*, 215.
3R.* *July 20*, 636.
l. Commons Amendts.* *July 23*, 787; *July 24*, 985.

Marine Biological Association
Board of Trade Consulting with reference to Fishery Questions
Q. Mr. Price; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *July 26*, 1319.

Marine Biological Association—*cont.*
Plymouth Laboratory—Investigation into Fish Questions
Q. Mr. Price ; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *July 26*, 1319.
Stockholm Conference—Consulting the Marine Biological Association
Q. Mr. Price ; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *July 26*, 1320.

Marines, Royal
Officers' Clothing—Hot Weather Uniform
Q. Mr. Arnold-Forster ; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *July 23*, 863.
Peking Legation—British Marine Guard, *see* China—Anti-Foreign Rising, etc.

Market Weighton Drainage and Navigation Bill
l. Reported with Amendts., *July 19*, 409.
3R.* *July 26*, 1266.

Marks, Mr. H. H. [Tower Hamlets, St. George's]
Companies Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1075, 1091, 1104, 1106, 1108, 1121, 1133, 1148.

Marriage
Act of 1898—Number of Registered Buildings, Number of Marriages, etc.—Return Presented, *July 25*, 1162.

Martial Law in South Africa
see South African War.

Martin, Private
Death of, at Bloemfontein—Delay in Notifying to Relatives
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 16*, 66.

Massey-Mainwaring, Mr. W. F. B. [Finsbury, Central]
Chelsea Hospital Gardens—Hours of Closing, *July 16*, 67.
Public Galleries, Sunday Opening—Sale of Catalogues, *July 16*, 86.

Massy, Lord
Shannon Water and Electric Power Bill, 2R., *July 23*, 794.

Mather, Mr. W. [Lancashire, Rossendale]
Education — Consultative Committee, Constitution and Functions of, *July 23*, 869.
Water-tube Boilers and Naval Ships, *July 17*, 321.

Mauritius
Barracks for—Mr. Wyndham's Statement, *July 27*, 1533.
British Central Africa Rifles, Misconduct of—Laying Papers on the Table
Q. Sir B. Gurdon ; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *July 20*, 651.

Mayo Assizes
Contempt of Court—Case of Mr. W. O'Brien
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill ; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 20*, 666.

Mayo, Earl of
County Courts (Ireland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 16*, 40.
Shannon Water and Electric Power Bill, 2R., *July 23*, 789—Fisheries Inspector's Report, *July 23*, 841.
Tithe Rent-charge (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *July 19*, 422, 430 ; *Com.*, *July 23*, 841 ; *Rep.*, *July 26*, 1277, 1282.

Medals
South African War, *see* that title.

Medical Act (1858) Extension Bill
c. 1R.* *July 20*, 673.

Medical Arrangements in South Africa
see South African War—Hospital and Medical Arrangements.

Medical Department of the Army
see Army.

Mediterranean Fleet
Cruises, Nature and Extent of, Sea-training, etc.—Admirals' Reports
Q. Sir J. Colomb ; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *July 24*, 1048.
Training of Officers — Amount of Sea Service, etc.
Os. Sir J. Colomb, Mr. Goschen, *July 17*, 339, 340.

Members of Local Authorities Relief Bill
l. Com., *July 16*, 36.
Reported without Amendts., *July 17*, 193.
Reported with Amendts., *July 19*, 420.
3R.* *July 20*, 621.
c. 1R.* *July 26*, 1345.

Mercantile Marine
Belleville Boilers on British Steamers
Q. Mr. D. MacIver ; *A.* Mr. J. Collings, *July 17*, 229.

Merchant Seamen's Fund
Account of Receipt and Expenditure Presented, *July 16*, 8, 57.

Merchant Shipping (Liability of Shipowners and Others) Bill
l. Reported without Amendt., *July 17*, 193.
Reported with Amendts., *July 19*, 420.
3R., *July 20*, 619 ; *July 26*, 1269.

Merchant Shipping (Liability of Shipowners and Others) Bill
Debate on Third Reading, *July 26*, 1269.
Aggregate Liability of Dock and Harbour Authorities, 1269, 1270, 1271, 1274.
Largest Vessel entering the Dock, Harbour or Canal—Obtaining Information as to Tonnage, etc., 1271, 1272.

Mersey
Port Guardship, proposed—Recruiting at Liverpool, etc.
Q. Mr. C. M'Arthur; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *July 24*, 1049.

Mersey Railway Bill
c. Con. July 17*, 215.
3R.* *July 20*, 636.
l. Commons Amendts.* *July 23*, 787.

Messenger Company
see District Messenger Company.

Metal Industry
Belgium—Report Presented, *July 17*, 192.

Metric System
Foreign Countries—Reports from H.M. Representatives in Europe Presented, *July 25*, 1162; *July 26*, 1268.

Metropolitan District Railway Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *July 27*, 1449.

Metropolitan Police Force
Deficiency in Strength, Supply of Recruits, etc.
Q. Capt. Norton; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *July 19*, 471.

Metropolitan Water Supply
Royal Commission—Maps, Plans, and Diagrams to accompany Minutes of Evidence and Report Presented, *July 18*, 343; *July 19*, 414.

Mid-Kent Water Bill
l. Reported with Amendts., *July 27*, 1449.

Midland Great Western Railway of Ireland Bill
l. Report from Joint Committee, *July 20*, 587.
3R.* *July 20*, 586.
c. 1R.* *July 20*, 638.
Standing Orders, *July 24*, 1037.

Midland Railway Bill
l. 3R.* *July 19*, 410.
c. Lords Amendts.* *July 24*, 1037.

Midland Railway Company
Free Luggage—Increased Scale
Qs. Sir C. Gull, Mr. Trevelyan; *As.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 16*, 74.

Military Attache's Warning
see Defence of the Empire.

Military Lands
Purchases of Land by County and Borough Councils—Number of Acres purchased, Amount expended, etc.
Q. Capt. Sinclair; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 23*, 859.

Military Lands Bill
c. 2R. *July 23*, 890.

Military Lands Bill
Debate on Second Reading, *July 23*, 890.
Acquisition of Land
Compulsory Acquisition, etc., 892, 895, 898.
Compulsory hiring, 905.
Control of Land used for Rifle Ranges, 899, 907.
Cost of Sites for Rifle Ranges—Allocation of Cost, 892, 898, 906, 907, 909, 915, 917, 919, 923.
Ireland, Application of the Bill to—Compensation for Land, etc., 910, 920.
Glenbeigh, Acquiring land at, 922.
Kilworth Rifle Range, Acquisition of Additional Land for, 912, 922.
Local Authorities' Co-operation with Volunteer Corps Borrowing Powers, etc., 893, 899, 901, 908.
Rates, Charges on, 900.
Sea, Public Rights on the Sea, Three-mile Limit, etc., 905.
Volunteer Corps, Borrowing Powers, 893, 899.

Military Manœuvres Bill
Standing Orders, *July 16*, 54.
Petition referred to Select Committee on Standing Orders, *July 16*, 55.
Bill Withdrawn, *July 16*, 188.

Militia
Bounty, Pay and Allowances, Increase in
Q. Mr. Shee; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 26*, 1303.
Camden Fort Gun Fatality, *see* title Camden Fort.
Embodiment Expenditure
Wyndham's, Mr., Statement, *July 27*, 1531.
Furlough Pay of Embodied Militiamen
Q. Sir J. Dorington; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 17*, 225.
Irish Regiments in England—Granting Furlough during Harvest Time
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 16*, 66.
Officers
Pay—Drawing Retired and Full Pay at the same time
Q. Maj. Rasch; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 27*, 1507.

Militia—*cont.*
Officers—*cont.*
Sergeant-Majors—Warrant Rank
Q. Maj. Rasch; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 27*, 1508.
Re-organisation—Regulations with Reference to Volunteering for Foreign Service, etc.
Os. Lord Braye, Marquess of Lansdowne, *July 26*, 1285, 1286.
Strength and Organisation
O. Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 27*, 1560.

Milward, Col. V. [Warwick, Stratford-on-Avon]
Business of the House—Companies Bill, etc., *July 16*, 109.
Companies Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1134.
District Messenger Company — Non-renewal of Licence, *July 23*, 873.
Indian Budget—Famine, Imperial Grant, etc., *July 26*, 1421.

Mines Regulation Acts
Burnley Miners—Enforcing Check-weighing Clauses, Petitions of Miners, etc.
Q. Mr. Stanhope; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *July 26*, 1317.

Mint
Annual Report of Deputy Master and Comptroller Presented, *July 16*, 8, 56.

Missionaries
China—Reported Massacre in Shan-si
Q. Mr. J. Wilson; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *July 20*, 642.

Monaghan
Asylum Works, Expenditure on
Claims on County Council, Giving Notice of Proposed Loans, etc.
Q. Mr. Daly; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 19*, 480.
Contract for Work, Superintendent, etc.
Q. Mr. Daly; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 20*, 660.
Crime, Absence of—Removing Operation of Peace Preservation Act, proposed
Q. Mr. Daly; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 23*, 877.
Petty Sessions—Right of Appeal Refused to M'Guigan and Hughes, Mitigation of Sentence proposed
Q. Mr. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 16*, 81.

Money-lending Bill
c. Report from Standing Committee on Law, *July 24*, 1064.

Monitors, Ireland
Easter Examinations—Delay in publishing Results
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 20*, 664.
Instruction of, by Irish National Teachers—Gratuities, Results of Easter Examination, etc.
Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 19*, 483.

Monk, Mr. C. J. [Gloucester]
Military Lands Bill, 2R., *July 23*, 909.

Monkswell, Lord
Copyright Bill, *Com.*, *July 23*, 837.
Death Certification—Legislation, *July 17*, 209.

Moore, Mr. A. J. [Londonderry]
Derry Magistracy—Number of Roman Catholic and Protestant Magistrates, etc., *July 27*, 1520.
Limavady Postmastership Appointment, *July 27*, 1523.

More, Mr. R. J. [Shropshire, Ludlow]
Military Lands Bill, 2R., *July 23*, 922.

Morgan, Mr. W. P. [Merthyr Tydvil]
China—Anti-Foreign Rising, Peking—Safety of British Legation, etc., *July 17*, 218; *July 27*, 1552.

Morley Corporation Bill
c. 2R.* *July 16*, 53.
Reported with Amendts., *July 27*, 1496.

Morley, Earl of
Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill, 2R., *July 20*, 629.
Irish Railway Amalgamation Bill, 3R., *July 27*, 1452, 1453.
Local Government Provisional Order Bills, Suspension of Standing Orders, *July 16*, 6.
Reading Clerkship Vacancy—Appointment of Legal Assistant, etc., *July 24*, 1019, 1023.
Shannon Water and Electric Power Bill, 2R., *July 23*, 795.

Morris, Lord
Poor Removal Bill, 3R., *July 19*, 416.

Morton, Mr. A. H. A. [Deptford]
Railways, Purchase of by Indian Government—Rate of Interest in Settling Annuities, *July 26*, 1314.

Motherwell and Bellshill Railway Bill
c. Reported with Amendts., *July 16*, 55.
*Con.** and 3R.* *July 24*, 1038.
l. Commons Amendts.* *July 26*, 1267.

Moulton, Mr. J. F. [Cornwall, Launceston]
Post Office Sites (Re-committed) Bill *Com.*, *July 18*, 399.

Mounted Infantry
Australian Resources for Raising
Os. Lord Brassey, *July 19*, 436; Marquess of Lansdowne, 446.

Mowbray, Sir R. [Lambeth, Brixton]
Dublin Corporation Bill, *Con.*, *July 26*, 1293.

Muldowney, Irish Convict
Remission of Sentence, proposed
Qs. Mr. J. Roche, Mr. Dillon, Mr. S. MacNeill; *As.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 20*, 664.

Municipal Authorities
Income Tax—Rate of Income Tax chargeable on Interest paid by Municipal Authorities
Q. Sir A. Hickman; *A.* Sir M. H. Beach, *July 19*, 470.

Municipal Trading
Joint Committee, Report Presented, *July 27*, 1458, 1524.

Munster Fusiliers
Walsh, Private, Under-age Recruit, *see* Walsh.

Murnaghan, Mr. G. [Tyrone, Mid]
Intermediate Education (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *July 19*, 525.

Murray, Col. W. [Bath]
Hospital and Medical Arrangements in South Africa, Inquiry—Inquiry into Results of Inoculation against Enteric Fever, *July 23*, 854.

Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G.—*Lord Advocate* [Buteshire]
Avoch Harbour Accommodation, Improvement of—Grant-in-aid, proposed, *July 16*, 78.
Education (Scotland) Act, 1897—Imperial Grants, *July 20*, 658.
Inver Water Supply—Delay in Completing Works, *July 23*, 877.
Lewis, Island of
Insanitary Condition, Enforcing Provisions of Public Health Act, etc., *July 16*, 77.
Road between Cromore and Graver, Delay in Construction, *July 23*, 876.
Sheriff Court Procedure—Report of Committee, *July 26*, 1330.
University Fees—Return, *July 20*, 659.

Museums
see Names of Museums.

Music
Teachers of Music Registration Bill, *see* that title.

Musketry Training
Lessons of the South African War
O. Sir H. Vincent, *July 27*, 1573.

Muzzling Regulations
Cork—Suspension of Regulations
Q. Mr. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. Plunkett, *July 27*, 1522.

Natal
Censorship of Letters and Telegrams—Correspondence Presented, *July 24*, 1040.
Loyalists' Losses, Compensation for—Payment out of Colonial Funds, etc.
Q. Sir A. Scoble; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *July 17*, 220.
Natal Mercury, Letter Addressed to—Publication in South African Blue-book
Q. Capt. Donelan; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *July 20*, 645.

National Coal Reserve
see Coal.

National Defences
see Defence of the Empire.

National Education
Ireland, *see* Education—Irish Questions.

National Gallery
Ireland—Report Presented, *July 25*, 1162; *July 26*, 1268.
Sunday Opening—Sale of Catalogues
Q. Mr. Massey-Mainwaring; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 16*, 86.

National School Teachers, Ireland
Arrears of Fee Grant which accrued between the years 1893 and 1896
Q. Capt. Donelan; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 27*, 1523.
Bonus—Credit for Amount when New Salaries are being determined
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 26*, 1341.
Extra Subjects—Remuneration
Q. Mr. W. Abraham; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 19*, 483.
Grant for 1892-95—Payment of Arrears
Q. Mr. M'Dermott; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 23*, 879.
Paying to Next-of-kin of Deceased Teachers, etc.
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 20*, 662.

[*cont.*

National School Teachers, Ireland—*cont.*
Holyhead, *see* that title.
Income—Memorandum as to Provisional Payments, etc.
Q. Mr. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 26*, 1341.
Monitors, Instruction of — Gratuities, Results of Easter Examination, etc.
Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 19*, 483.
New Rules—Memorandum from Teachers' Association
Q. Mr. Flynn; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 19*, 482.
Poor Law Schools—Teachers in Contributary Unions
Qs. Capt. Donelan, Mr. M. Healy; *As.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 26*, 1342.
Result Fees, Results Period terminating on June 30th—Payment of Equivalent Grant in October
Q. Mr. M'Dermott; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 23*, 879.
Salaries
Delay in Payment
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 24*, 1064.
Future Scale, Allowing for Diminutions of Salary owing to Epidemics, etc., during past three years
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 20*, 663.
Omission in Extract from New Code presented to Parliament—Classification, Promotions, etc.
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 20*, 663.
Scheme for Payment of Teachers, etc., *see* Irish Education Bill.
Sneem—Teacher's Residence Site
Q. Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr G. W. Balfour, *July 20*, 662.

Naval Lord
Residence of First Sea Lord
Os. Admiral Field, Earl of Dalkeith, *July 17*, 339, 340.
Q. Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *July 20*, 649; *Q.* Admiral Field; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *July 26*, 1310.

Naval Reserve
Colonial Naval Reserve, proposed Enrolment
Debate (Lords), *July 19*, 435.

Naval Reserve Bill
c. 1R.* *July 17*, 241.
2R., *July 23*, 966.
Com. and *Rep.** *July 26*, 1445.

Naval Reserve Bill
Debate on Second Reading and in Committee, *July 23*, 966; *July 26*, 1445.
Age Limit, Service Limit, etc., 967.
Calling out Reserve—Parliamentary Control, 1445.
New Reserve not to be amalgamated with Royal Naval Reserve, 967.
Period of Enlistment, 1445, 1446.
Twelve years Service Men—Reasons for not joining the Royal Naval Reserve, 968, 969.

Navy
First Lord—Rt. Hon. G. J. Goschen.
Lord of the Admiralty—Mr. A. Chamberlain.
Secretary—Mr. W. E. Macartney.
Admiralty Staff, Increase in
O. Sir F. Flannery, *July 17*, 270.
Armaments for Armoured Cruisers
O. Capt. Phillpotts, *July 17*, 311.
Armour—Limiting Naval Programme to Output in Armour, etc.
Goschen's, Mr., Statement, *July 17*, 241, 263, 264.
Os. Sir F. Flannery, 263, 264; Sir C. Dilke, 273.
"Belleisle" Experiments
Goschen's, Mr, Statement, *July 17*, 246.
O. Capt. Phillpotts, 312.
Boilers—Water-tube Boilers *versus* Cylindrical Boilers
Os. Sir F. Flannery, 266; Sir C. Dilke, 271; Mr. G. Bowles, 279; Mr. Allan, 287; Admiral Field, 291; Mr. C H. Wilson, 294; Sir E. Gourley, 299; Sir J. Colomb, 302; Capt. Phillpotts, 309; Sir U. Kay-Shuttleworth, 314; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 317; Mr. Mather, 321; Mr. Penn, 328; Mr. MacIver, 330; Mr. Walton, 334.
"Argonaut" and "Vindictive," H.M.S.—Speed during Manœuvres of 1899, Repairs, etc.
Qs. Mr. G. Bowles, Sir F. Flannery; *As.* Mr. Goschen, *July 17*, 227.
Committee of Inquiry, Terms of Reference and Constitution of Committee
Q. Sir U. Kay-Shuttleworth; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *July 26*, 1311; *Q.* Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *July 27*, 1510.
"Europa," H.M.S.—Defects during Manœuvres of 1899, Speed, etc.
Q. Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *July 17*, 227.
Expenditure since 1895—Belleville Boilers
Qs. Mr. Hedderwick, Mr. G. Bowles; *As.* Mr. Macartney, *July 19*, 463.

[*cont.*

Navy—*cont.*

Boilers—Water-tube Boilers *versus* Cylindrical Boilers—*cont.*

Goschen's, Mr., Statement, *July 17*, 247.

Advantages Claimed, 253.

Advantages and Defects of Water-tube Boilers, 250.

Experiences of other Countries, 255.
O. Mr. G. Bowles, 283.

Mercantile Marine Argument, 259.

"Powerful" Experience, 252.

United States Testimony, 256.

Manœuvres of 1899—Admiral Domville's Report and the Statement in the Memorandum
Q. Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *July 17*, 227.

Channel Fleet
Cruises, Nature and Extent of Sea-training, etc.—Admirals' Reports
Q. Sir J. Colomb; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *July 24*, 1048.

Visit to Invergordon, proposed
Q. Mr. Caldwell; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *July 23*, 862.

Chaplains—Roman Catholic Chaplains
Q. Capt. Donelan; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *July 27*, 1510.

China—Anti-Foreign Rising, *see* China—British Forces.

Coal—Emergency Contracts
Alteration of Conditions
Q. Mr. D. A. Thomas; *A.* Mr. Macartney, *July 17*, 227.

Manœuvres, separate Contracts for—Coal Supply for South Africa and China
Q. Mr. D. A. Thomas; *A.* Mr. Macartney, *July 20*, 650.

Cordite
Explosion on Board the "Revenge"
O. Admiral Field, *July 17*, 338; *Q.* Admiral Field; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *July 26*, 1310.

Reserve of Cordite
O. Sir J. Colomb, *July 17*, 337.

Courts-martial
Application of Criminal Evidence Act
Q. Mr. H. D. Greene; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *July 24*, 1049.

Return Presented, *July 16*, 7, 57.

Defence of the Empire, *see* that title.

Dock Accommodation for Ships—New Works, etc.
Os. Viscount Sidmouth, Earl of Hopetoun, Earl Spencer, *July 17*, 207.

Expenditure
Appropriation Accounts Referred to Committee, *July 27*, 1525.

Colonial Contribution
O. Mr. E. Robertson, *July 17*, 330.

Navy—*cont.*

Expenditure—*cont.*
Holding back money placed at the disposal of the Admiralty, alleged
Goschen's, Mr., Statement, *July 17*, 244.

Savings and Deficiencies, etc., Referred to Committee, *July 27*, 1524.

(*see also* Navy Estimates.)

Greenwich Hospital and Travers Foundation—Income and Expenditure, Statement—Approval
Resolution (Mr. A. Chamberlain), *July 19*, 584.

Gun Boats and Inland Navigation in China, *see* China—British Gun Boats.

Guns
Erosion of, by Cordite—Committee of Inquiry
Qs. Sir C. Dilke, Mr. Paulton; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 17*, 226.

Reserve of Guns, etc.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, Mr. Goschen, *July 17*, 337, 338.

Jersey — Foreign Men-of-War Manœuvring in and out of Harbours
Qs. Mr. Lambert, Mr. Arnold-Forster; *As.* Mr. Goschen, *July 23*, 863.

Machinery—Limiting Naval Programme to Output in Machinery, etc.
Goschen's, Mr., Statement, *July 17*, 241.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *July 17*, 273; Mr. G. Bowles, 278.

Marine Guard at Peking, *see* China—Anti-Foreign Rising—Peking.

Marine Officers—Hot Weather Uniform on Board Ship and Ashore
Q. Mr. Arnold-Forster; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *July 23*, 863.

Mediterranean Fleet—Cruises, Nature and Extent of Sea-training, etc.,—Admirals' Reports
Q. Sir J. Colomb; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *July 24*, 1048.

Mersey, Placing Port Guardship in, proposed — Recruiting at Liverpool, etc.
Q. Mr. C. M'Arthur; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *July 24*, 1049.

Non-inflammable Wood, *see* sub-heading Shipbuilding.

Picric Acid, Manufacture of, in England—Sufficient supply
Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 17*, 226; *O.* Sir C. Dilke, *July 17*, 336.

Recruiting—Encouraging Recruiting at Liverpool
Q. Mr. C. M'Arthur; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *July 24*, 1049.

Residence of First Sea Lord
Os. Adm. Field, Earl of Dalkeith, *July 17*, 339, 340; *Q.* Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *July 20*, 649; *Q.* Adm. Field; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *July 26*, 1310.

Navy—*cont.*
Sea Service in the Channel and Mediterranean Squadrons
Os. Sir J. Colomb, Mr. Goschen, *July 17*, 339, 340; *Q.* Sir J. Colomb; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *July 24*, 1048.

Shah of Persia's Visit to England—Review, proposed
Q. Sir E. Gourley; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *July 26*, 1311.

Shipbuilding Programme
"Alarming" Growth of Expenditure
O. Mr. Robertson, *July 17*, 329.

Armstrong, Whitworth, and Co.'s Offer
Os. Sir F. Flannery, Mr. Goschen, *July 17*, 263, 264.

Goschen's, Mr., Statement, *July 17*, 243.

Insufficient Naval Programme for the Safety of the Empire
O. Sir C. Dilke, *July 17*, 272.

Limiting Naval Programme to Output in Armour and Machinery
Os. Mr. Goschen, *July 17*, 241, 263, 264; Sir F. Flannery, 263, 264; Sir C. Dilke, 273; Mr. G. Bowles, 278.

Non-inflammable Wood
Use of, in the Construction of Ships
Os. Sir C. Dilke, Mr. Goschen, *July 17*, 247; Sir C. Dilke, 272.

Wood used on Foreign Men-of-War, etc.
Q. Mr. Provand; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *July 16*, 68.

Producing Power, Development of
O. Sir J. Colomb, *July 17*, 303.

Type of Ship to be Constructed
Goschen's, Mr., Statement, *July 17*, 246.

Vote for, *July 17*, 241.

Ships—Wooden Decks
O. Capt. Phillpotts, *July 17*, 313.

Stores
Reserve of Warlike Stores, etc.
Os. Sir J. Colomb, Mr. Macartney, *July 17*, 337.

Stores transferred to Land Service for South Africa—Return
Q. Mr. E. Robertson; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 24*, 1047; *O.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 27*, 1611.

Return Presented, *July 24*, 988, 1040.

Submarine Boats
Experiments—Watching Experiments Abroad, etc.
Os. Mr. Harwood, *July 17*, 303; Captain Phillpotts, 313; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 321; Mr. Goschen, 333.

Navy—*cont.*
Submarine Boats—*cont.*
Trials of, during French Naval Manœuvres
Q. Mr. Harwood; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *July 26*, 1310.

Torpedo Boats
Naval Manœuvres, Speed, Endurance, etc.—Statistics
Q. Sir E. Gourley; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *July 27*, 1510.

Purchase of—Turbine Principle, etc.
Goschen's, Mr., Statement, *July 17*, 243.
O. Sir C. Dilke, *July 17*, 277.

Training Squadron—Dismantled Sailing Ships
Officers in Charge of Dismantled Sailing Ships—Ships available for Service, etc.
Q. Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *July 23*, 862.

Recommissioning—Masts *v.* Cruisers, Ascertaining Opinions of Captains, etc.
Q. Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *July 26*, 1312.

Transport Service, *see* that title.

Turbine Principle—Torpedo Boats, etc.
Goschen's, Mr., Statement, *July 17*, 243.

"Victoria and Albert," Royal Yacht—Removal of Silicate Cotton, etc.
Q. Sir E. Gourley; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *July 27*, 1509.

Workmen's Compensation Act—Number of Men Receiving Compensation, Amount of Compensation, etc.—Return Presented, *July 16*, 57.

Navy Estimates

Additional—Supplementary Estimate, £793,200, *Com.*, *July 17*, 336; *Rep.** *July 18*, 404.

Admiralty Office, £267,100, *Com.*, *July 17*, 338; *Rep.** 404.

Appropriation Accounts Referred to Com. *July 27*, 1525.

Holding back Money placed at the Disposal of the Admiralty
Goschen's, Mr., Statement, *July 17*, 244.

Savings, Deficiencies, etc., Referred to Com., *July 27*, 1524.

Shipbuilding Contract Work, Repairs, etc., £6,739,000, *Com.*, *July 17*, 241; *Rep.** *July 18*, 403.

Shipbuilding, Repairs, Maintenance, etc., —Material, £4,139,100, *Com.** *July 17*, 336; *Rep.** *July 18*, 403.

Shipbuilding, Repairs, Maintenance, etc. —Personnel—£2,523,000, *Com.*, *July 17*, 336; *Rep.** *July 18*, 404.

(*for* subjects discussed, *see* their subheadings under Navy.)

Navy and Army Expenditure
see titles Navy and Army, *also* titles Navy Estimates and Army Estimates.

Nazareth Sisters
see Sisters of Nazareth.

Netley Hospital
Treatment of Discharged Soldiers, Case of Private Weir, *see* Weir.

New Member
Morrison, Mr. J. A., for County of Wiltshire (Southern or Wilton Division), *July 23*, 889.

Newbliss
Post Office—Late Postmistress Residing in Post Office, Number of Men and Women Employed, etc.
Q. Mr. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 19*, 473.
Postman attending Orange Demonstration at Clones
Q. Mr. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 24*, 1063.
Telegrams—Delivery by Girls
Q. Mr. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 27*, 1523.

Newcastle-upon-Tyne Electric Supply Bill
l. Report from Committee of Selection, *July 19*, 413; *July 23*, 788; *July 26*, 1266.

Newry, Keady, and Tynan Light Railway Bill
l. Report from Committee of Selection, *July 16*, 4; *July 17*, 191.
Report from Select Committee and Bill Committed, *July 23*, 787.
Reported with Amendts., *July 24*, 985.

Niger Coast Protectorate
Spirits, Amount Imported in 1898 and 1899—Duties paid on Stocks by Native Traders, etc.
Q. Mr. Lawrence; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *July 23*, 867.

Nonconformist Teachers
Holyhead National School, *see* Holyhead.

Non-Inflammable Wood
Use of, in Construction of Naval Ships, *see* Navy—Shipbuilding.

Norfolk
Foot and Mouth Disease Regulations—County Council Resolution
Q. Mr. Soames; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 16*, 76.

North British Railway Bill
c. Reported with Amendts., *July 17*, 216.
Con. July 23*, 845.
3R.* *July 26*, 1295.
l. Commons Amendts.* *July 27*, 1456.

North Eastern Railway Bill
*c. Con.** and 3R.* *July 26*, 1295.
l. Commons Amendts.* *July 27*, 1456.

North Eastern Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill
c. Reported with Amendts., *July 18*, 341.
*Con.** and 3R.* *July 25*, 1161.
l. Commons Amendts.* *July 26*, 1267.

North Metropolitan Electric Power Supply Bill
c. Con. July 16*, 53.
3R.* *July 17*, 215.
l. 1R.* *July 17*, 190.
Examiner's Certificate referred to Standing Orders Committee, *July 19*, 409.
2R.* *July 24*, 985.
Report from Committee of Selection, *July 24*, 987; *July 26*, 1267.
Standing Orders, *July 19*, 409; *July 23*, 785.

North Metropolitan Railway and Canal Bill
c. Lords Amendts.* *July 16*, 53.

Northbrook, Earl of
Indian Expenditure—Report of Royal Commission, *July 20*, 595.

Northumberland, Duke of
Agricultural Holdings Bill, *Com.*, *July 27*, 1485, 1489, 1490.
Members of Local Authorities Relief Bill, *Com.*, *July 16*, 37.

Norton, Capt. C. W. [Newington, W.]
Aldershot Entertainments, Holding in Recreation Rooms instead of Canteens, *July 26*, 1306.
Metropolitan Police Force—Deficiency in Strength, Supply of Recruits, etc., *July 19*, 471.
South African War—Honnen Spruit Disaster, Despatch of ex-prisioners to guard Spruit, etc., *July 26*, 1302.
Volunteers Bill, 2R., *July 18*, 362.
Wales, War Office Employee, Discharge of—Bonus, *July 23*, 859, 860.

Norton, Lord
Education Bill, 2R., *July 23*, 796.

Nottingham Corporation Bill
c. Lords Amendts.* *July 20*, 636.

Norwood Green
Postal Deliveries
Q. Mr. Bigwood; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 26*, 1325.

Nurses
South African War, *see* that title.

Nyassa Railway
Construction of—Government Loan
Q. Sir B. Gurdon; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *July 20*, 651.

O'Brien, Mr. J. F. X. [Cork]
Intermediate Education (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *July 19*, 523.
Irish Language, Use of, in Irish Schools in place of English, *July 20*, 738.

O'Brien, Mr. P. [Kilkenny]
Cattle Carried by Rail, Providing Water for, *July 23*, 873.
Civil Service—Junior Civil Service Examinations, *July 26*, 1329.
County Court Acts Administration—Traders' Grievances, Legislation proposed, *July 16*, 86.
Drumconrath Postal Arrangements, *July 26*, 1335.
Dublin Sorting Staff Memorial, *July 26*, 1332.
Eggs—Russian Eggs Imported to Ireland, Exportation to England as Irish Eggs, *July 20*, 670.
Howth Petty Sessions, Prosecution of Boatmen by Board of Works, etc., *July 24*, 1061, 1062.
Irish Railway Amalgamation Bills—Tribunal of Appeal, *July 26*, 1339.
Kilkenny Postal Arrangements—Boggan and Blanchfieldboy, *July 26*, 1333.
Limerick Telegraph Messengers, *July 26*, 1332.
Militia—Irish Regiments in England, Granting Furlough during Harvest-time, *July 16*, 66.
National School Teachers
Bonus, *July 26*, 1341.
Grant for 1892-1895—Payment of Arrears, *July 20*, 662.
Salaries
Delay in Payment, alleged, *July 24*, 1064.
Future Scale
Allowing for Diminutions of Salary during past three years, *July 20*, 663.
Classifications, Promotions, etc., *July 20*, 663.
Paupers, Deportation of, to Ireland—Case of J. Jones, *July 16*, 78.
Postcards—Returning Undelivered Postcards, *July 19*, 471.

'Brien, Mr. P.—*cont.*
Pretoria Magazine, Attempt to blow up—Lieut. Tossel and Mr. S. Gillingham condemned to Death, *July 17*, 224; *July 24*, 1043, 1044.
Volunteers—Irish Regiments, Formation of, proposed—Establishment of Rifle Clubs, etc., *July 20*, 665.

O'Brien, Mr. W.
Mayo Assizes—Contempt of Court
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 20*, 666.

Observatory, Greenwich
Report Presented, *July 19*, 414, 453.

O'Connor, Mr. J. [Wicklow, W.]
Arklow Drift-net Fishing, Fishermen's Petition for Removal of Restrictions, *July 23*, 885.
Greystones Gravel — Removal of, from Foreshore, etc., *July 16*, 79.
Irish Cattle, Landing at Port of London Prohibited, *July 16*, 81.

O'Connor, Mr. T. P. [Liverpool, Scotland]
Irish Language, Use of, in Irish Schools in place of English, *July 20*, 755.
Tithe Rent-charge (Ireland) Bill, 3R., *July 16*, 120, 162, 180.

O'Donnell, Mr.
Dungloe Sessions—Truck Act Prosecution
Q. Mr. T. D. Sullivan; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *July 23*, 882.

Oil in Tobacco Bill
c. 2R., *July 18*, 402.
Com., *Rep.** and 3R.* *July 19*, 583.
l. 1R.* *July 20*, 589.
2R., *July 26*, 1285.
*Com.** *July 27*, 1495.

Old Age Pensions for Soldiers
O. Sir J. Colomb, *July 27*, 1553.

Oldham Corporation Bill
l. 3R.* *July 26*, 1266.

O'Malley, Mr. W. [Galway, Connemara]
Irish Language, Use of, in Irish Schools, in place of English, *July 20*, 674.

Onslow, Earl of
India
Expenditure—Report of Royal Commission, *July 20*, 605.
Famine—Monsoon, Rainfall, etc., *July 16*, 9.
Irrigation Works, Expenditure on, etc., *July 23*, 835.

Ordnance Factories
Revised Estimate of Charge Presented, *July 20*, 640.

Paisley Waterworks Provisional Order Bill
c. 2R.* *July 16*, 54.
Reported and 3R.* *July 20*, 637.
l. 1R.* *July 20*, 587.
2R.* *July 26*, 1267.
*Con.** and *Rep.** *July 27*, 1457.
Standing Orders, *July 19*, 451; *July 23*, 785.

Palace of Westminster
see titles House of Commons, House of Lords, and Houses of Parliament.

Palatine Court of Durham Bill
Bill Withdrawn, *July 16*, 188.

Parliament
House of Commons and House of Lords, *see* those titles.
Private Bill Legislation, Cost of—Delay in presenting Return
Q. Mr. D. A. Thomas; *A.* Mr. J. Collings, *July 17*, 235.

Parliamentary Elections
Polling Districts, *see* that title.

Parliamentary Procedure
Changes in, proposed—Blocking Notices, Debating Bills Reported without Amendments, etc.
Q. Mr. C. Williams; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 19*, 484.
Motions for Adjournment of the House to Discuss Matters of Urgent Public Importance, *see* Speaker's Rulings.

Passenger Steamer Service
Jersey
Q. Mr. Lambert; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *July 26*, 1320.

Passengers' Luggage
see Luggage.

Patriotic Fund Commissioners
South African War Funds Administration, Government Proposals, etc.
Os. Mr. Galloway, *July 16*, 107; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 114.

Patriotism of the Colonies
see Colonies.

Paulton, Mr. J. M. [Durham, Bishop Auckland]
"Custodian," Transport Ship from South Africa—Complaints against Provisions, etc., *July 19*, 457.
Guns, Erosion of, by Cordite—Committee of Inquiry, *July 17*, 226.

Pauper Children
Boarding Out—Defective and Epileptic Children, Regulation against boarding out in the same Home with Poor Law Children
Q. Mr. Lawrence; *A.* Sir J. Gorst, *July 17*, 236.
Receiving Home, Establishment of, at Lambeth—Local Government Board suggestion
Q. Mr. Flower; *A.* Mr. Chaplin, *July 24*, 1053.
Religious Instruction — Rockhall and Rochford House, Non-appointment of Church of England Chaplain by Willesden Board of Guardians, etc.
Q. Mr. Talbot; *A.* Mr. Chaplin, *July 17*, 232.
Wandsworth Board of Guardians offering free Pardon to Parents reclaiming deserted Children—Issue of Notice
Q. Mr. Flower; *A.* Mr. Chaplin, *July 24*, 1054.

Paupers
Deportation of Irish Paupers—Case of Joseph Jones
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *July 16*, 78.
Feeble-minded Paupers, Number and Condition of—Inquiry proposed
Q. Mr. Flower; *A.* Mr. Chaplin, *July 24*, 1053.

Peace Conference
Ratification of Convention
Q. Mr. J. A. Pease; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 20*, 670.

Peace Preservation Act
Removal of Operation from County Monaghan, proposed
Q. Mr. Daly; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 23*, 877.

Pease, Mr. H. P. [Darlington]
Lance Exhibition—Sergeant Cartwright's Claim, *July 16*, 67.

Pease, Mr. J. A. [Northumberland, Tyneside]
Debtors—Prison treatment, *July 19*, 470.
Peace Conference—Ratification of Convention, *July 20*, 670.
Prisons
Officials, Retiring Pensions—Memorial, *July 23*, 875.
Warders—Number of Reservists withdrawn, alleged insufficient Staff at Portland, *July 23*, 874.
Science and Art Directory, Alteration of—Clause 6 and Education Department Grants, *July 27*, 1516.

Peers
Attendance of, on Committees—Return Motion (Earl of Camperdown), *July 17*, 196.
Sat First in Parliament—Earl of Strafford, after the death of his Brother, *July 20*, 585.

Peking
see China—Anti-Foreign Rising.

Penal Legislation
India—Withdrawal of Recent Legislation, proposed
Q. Sir W. Wedderburn; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *July 19*, 468.

Penn, Mr. J. [Lewisham]
Water-tube Boilers on Naval Ships, *July 17*, 328.

Percy, Earl [Kensington, S.]
Kensington Gardens Regulations, *July 27*, 1513.

Perks, Mr. R. W. [Lincolnshire, Louth]
Companies Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1071, 1086, 1089, 1090, 1101, 1102, 1104, 1107, 1127, 1135.

Persia, Shah of
Visit to England—Naval Review
Q. Sir E. Gourley; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *July 26*, 1311.

Perth and Paisley Gas Provisional Orders Bill
l. 2R.* *July 16*, 4.
Com. and *Rep.** *July 26*, 1268.
3R.* *July 27*, 1457.

Petitions
Committee, Report Presented, *July 25*, 1162.

Philipps, Mr. J. W. [Pembroke]
Companies Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1111, 1133, 1141.

Phillpotts, Capt. A. S. [Devon, Torquay]
Armaments for Armoured Cruisers, *July 17*, 311.
"Belleisle" Experiments, *July 17*, 312.
Water-tube Boilers on Naval Ships, *July 17*, 309.
Wooden Decks, *July 17*, 313.

Phœnix Park
see Dublin.

Piccadilly
Widening—Obtaining Strip of Green Park, Proposal to London County Council
Qs. Mr. Coghill, Mr. G. Bowles; *As.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 24*, 1059.

Pickersgill, Mr. E. H. [Bethnal Green, S.W.]
Business of the House—Abandonment of the Lunacy Bill, etc., *July 16*, 98.
Indian Budget—Famine, Imperial Grant, etc., *July 26*, 1417.
London School Board Re-housing Schemes, *July 16*, 73.
South African War—Hospital and Medical Arrangements Commission
Powers to Enforce Attendance of Witnesses, etc., *July 24*, 1042.
Warrant of Prime Minister, *July 26*, 1300, 1301.

Picric Acid
Manufacture of, in England—Sufficient Supply for the Army and Navy
Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 11*, 226; *O.* Sir C. Dilke, *July 17*, 336.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill
*l. Com.** and *Rep.** *July 16*, 5.
Reported with Amendts., *July 17*, 191.
3R.* *July 19*, 412.
c. Lords Amendts.* *July 23*, 846.

Pierpoint, Mr. R. [Warrington]
Gibraltar Garrison—Officers' Houses, *July 27*, 1506.

Piers and Harbours
Ireland
Howth Harbour—Dredging proposed
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 24*, 1062.
Sneem Pier—Erection of Goods Store, Mr. Warden's Objections
Q. Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Plunkett, *July 20*, 669.
Scotland—Avoch Harbour Accommodation, Improvement of, Grant in Aid proposed
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *July 16*, 78.

Pilkington, Lt.-Col. R. [Lancashire, Newton]
Arms and Ammunition, Exportation of, to China by British Firms, etc.—Legislation, *July 23*, 853; *July 24*, 1041.
Military Lands Bill, 2R., *July 23*, 916.
Volunteers Bill, *Com.*, *July 23*, 941.

Pillar Boxes
Metropolis—Number in East Central District, Number divided into two Compartments, etc.
Q. Mr. Cohen; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 16*, 75.

Plunkett, Rt. Hon. H. C.—*Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture for Ireland* [Dublin County, S.]
Cahirciveen and Valentia—Erection of Perch or Buoy, proposed, etc., *July 23*, 886.

Plunkett, Rt. Hon. H. C.—*cont.*
Eggs—Russian Eggs Imported to Ireland, Exportation to England as Irish Eggs, *July 20*, 670.
Fisheries
Arklow Drift-net Fishing—Fishermen's Petition for Removal of Restrictions, *July 23*, 885.
Trawlers, Protection against—Naval Gun-boats, etc., *July 23*, 885.
West Clare Fishing Industry, Development of—Proposed Grant, *July 24*, 1064.
Irish Language, Use of, in Irish Schools in place of English, *July 20*, 728.
Potato Crop—Experiments with Electrical Conductors, *July 26*, 1341.
Sneem Pier—Erection of Goods Store, Mr. Warden's Objections, *July 20*, 669, 670.
Warble Fly—Precautions against, *July 20*, 670.

Plymouth, Stonehouse and Devonport Tramways Bill
l. Report from Committee of Selection, *July 16*, 3; *July 17*, 191.
Standing Orders, *July 19*, 409.
l. Report from Select Committee and Bill Committed, *July 23*, 787.
Reported with Amendts., *July 27*, 1449.

Police
Constabulary, Royal Irish, *see* that title.
Metropolitan Police Force—Deficiency in Strength, Supply of Recruits, etc.
Q. Capt. Norton; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *July 19*, 471.
Tyne River Police Force, Refusal of Home Secretary's Certificate—Correspondence Presented, *July 24*, 988, 1040.

Polling Districts
Yorkshire, West Riding—County Council Order Presented, *July 16*, 8, 56.

Poor Law
Pauper Children, *see* that title.

Poor Law Schools
Teachers in Contributary Unions, Ireland—Incomes Under New Grant, etc.
Qs. Capt. Donelan, Mr. M. Healy; *As.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 24*, 1342.

Poor Rate Reductions
Ireland—Tenants' Rights
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *July 26*, 1340.

Poor Removal Bill
l. Reported without Amendts., *July 17*, 192.
3R., *July 19*, 415.

Poor Relief (Ireland) Bill
c. 2R.* *July 26*, 1448.

Port Guardship
Mersey, Placing Guardship in, proposed
Q. Mr. C. M'Arthur; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *July 24*, 1049.

Port of London
Irish Cattle, Landing at, Prohibited
Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 16*, 81.

Portland Prison
Insufficient Staff of Officers, alleged—Cases of Flogging during last six months, etc.
Q. Mr. J. A. Pease; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *July 23*, 874.

Portland Urban District Gas Bill
l. Reported with Amendts., *July 16*, 2.
3R.* *July 19*, 410.
c. Lords Amendts.* *July 25*, 1161.

Portsmouth, Earl of
Ritualism in the Church—Continued Lawlessness in spite of the decision of Ecclesiastical Authorities, *July 16*, 10, 22.

Post Office
Postmaster General—Marquess of Londonderry.
Representative in the House of Commons—Rt. Hon. R. W. Hanbury.
Delay in Delivery of Letters, etc., *see* sub-heading Transfer of Work from General Post Office to Mount Pleasant.
District Messenger Company, *see* that title.
Dukinfield Postmastership—Number of Applicants, etc.
Q. Mr. M'Ghee; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 17*, 233.
Inspector of Postmen keeping Shop with off-licence—York Assistant Inspector
Q. Mr. Steadman; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 20*, 655.
Irish Questions
Belfast—Delivery of Letters, Later Delivery, proposed
Q. Sir J. Haslett; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 24*, 1062.
Castlebar—Site for new Office
Q. Dr. R. Ambrose; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 20*, 667.
Cootehill Postmastership—Condition attached to previous Appointment
Q. Mr. S. Young; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 19*, 472.
Cork—Dillon's Cross
Q. Mr. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 26*, 1335.

Post Office—*cont.*
Irish Questions—*cont.*
Cornalaragh Postal Deliveries—House to House Delivery
Q. Mr. Daly ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 20*, 668.
Drumconrath Postal Arrangements
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 26*, 1335.
Dublin Sorting Office
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 26*, 1332.
Greaghlone Letter-box—Neglecting to clear
Q. Mr. Daly ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 20*, 668.
Greeveguilla — Daily Delivery of Letters, proposed
Q. Mr. Flavin ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 16*, 80.
Limavady Postmastership Appointment
Q. Mr. A. J. Moore ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 27*, 1523.
Newbliss
Late Postmistress Residing in Post Office, Number of Men and Women Employed, etc.
Q. Mr. Macaleese ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 19*, 473.
Taylor, W., Rural Postman—Attendance at Orange Demonstration at Clones
Q. Mr. Macaleese ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 24*, 1063.
Rathfriland Postmastership — Appointment of Person Residing in Downpatrick Street
Q. Mr. Rentoul ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 17*, 239.
Liverpool, *see* that title.
Mails, *see* that title.
Postmen, *see* that title.
Scotch Questions—Delay in Delivery of Newspapers in South-Western District
Q. Sir M. Stewart ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 20*, 659.
Sheringham — Delay in Delivery of Letters, Disorganisation of London Post Office
Q. Sir G. Fardell ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 23*, 870.
Telegraph Service, *see* that title.
Transfer of Work from General Office to Mount Pleasant
Letter-boxes with two Compartments, Number in East Central District, etc.
Q. Mr. Cohen ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 16*, 75.
Officials charging Postmen and Sorters with causing Delay, alleged
Q. Mr. Steadman ; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 24*, 1058.

Post Office—*cont.*
Transfer of Work, etc.—*cont.*
Postmen—Overtime Pay
Q. Mr. Steadman ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 24*, 1058.
Sheringham, Delays at
Q. Sir G. Fardell ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 23*, 870.

Post Office Sites Bill
c. Com. (*Re-com.*), *July 18*, 387.
3R., *July 19*, 582.
l. 1R.* *July 20*, 589.
2R., *July 27*, 1470.
Standing Orders, *July 23*, 785.

Post Office Sites Bill
Debates in Committee, and on Third Reading, *July 18*, 387 ; *July 19*, 582.
Compensation
Arbitration, 401.
Leaseholders—Unexpired Terms of not more than Eighteen Months, 388.
Corporation of City of London, Special Protective Clauses relating to, 399, 582.
Local Authorities, Consulting, 394, 395, 399.
Plans and Books of Reference, Putting in Tea-room, etc., 393, 394, 395, 396, 401, 582.
Rates—Liability of Government to pay Rates, Assessment, etc., 387, 388, 389, 390, 397, 398, 582.
Re-housing—Number of Houses demolished, etc., 396, 397, 582.
Rights-of-Way — Powers of Postmaster General to Divert or Stop up Street, Road, or Passage—Post Office Court, E.C., etc., 393, 398, 399.
St. Mary, Whitechapel, Special Exemption Clause, 400, 401.

Postage
Excess Charge on unstamped Letters—Number of Charges, Stamps found loose in Post Offices, etc.
Q. Mr. Duckworth ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 23*, 871.

Postcards
Undelivered Postcards, Returning—Extra Charge, Request for Return, etc.
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 19*, 471.

Postmaster General
Marquess of Londonderry.

Postmen
Holiday Arrangements—Signing holiday Sheet, etc.
Q. Mr. Steadman ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 26*, 1327.

Postmen—*cont.*
Rural Postmen's Shelters, Relieving Postmen of the Responsibility of Providing
Q. Mr. Stead ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 27*, 1518.
Straw Hats
Qs. Dr. Tanner, Mr. Steadman, Mr. Labouchere ; *As.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 26*, 1326.
Uniforms—Weight of Summer and Winter Uniforms
Q. Dr. Tanner ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 27*, 1518.
York—Assistant Inspector of Postmen keeping Shop with Beer Off-licence
Q. Mr. Steadman ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 20*, 655.

Potato Crop
Experiments with Electrical Conductors
Q. Mr. Austin ; *A.* Mr. Plunkett, *July 26*, 1340.

Power, Mr. P. J. [Waterford, E.]
Intermediate Education (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *July 19*, 520.
Tithe Rent-charge (Ireland) Bill, *Re-com.*, *July 16*, 139.
Trawling in Irish Waters—Naval Gunboats for the Protection of Fisheries, *July 23*, 885, 886.

"Powerful," H.M.S.
Water-tube Boilers, etc.
Goschen's, Mr., Statement, *July 17*, 251.

Premier
Marquess of Salisbury.

Preservatives in Foods
Postponement of Prosecutions Pending Report of Committee
Q. Mr. Lambert ; *A.* Sir R. Finlay, *July 27*, 1517.
Report of Departmental Committee, Date of Issue
Qs. Mr. Lambert, Mr. T. M. Healy ; *As.* Mr. Chaplin, *July 26*, 1316.

Preston Corporation Bill
*c. Con.** and 3R.* *July 23*, 845.
l. Commons Amendts.* *July 24*, 986.

Pretoria
see South African War—Prisoners, Women sent over to the Enemy's Lines, etc.

Price, Mr. R. J. [Norfolk, E.]
Marine Biological Association and Fish Culture—Plymouth Laboratory, Stockholm Conference, etc., *July 26*, 1319, 1320.
Wimbledon—Proposed School Board, etc., *July 24*, 1055.

Primrose League Meeting
Lord Salisbury's Speech on National Defence, etc.
Os. Earl of Wemyss, *July 27*, 1460 ; Lord Salisbury, 1464 ; Earl of Rosebery, 1469 ; Earl of Kimberley, 1476.

Prison-made Goods
Seizures of Foreign Goods—Value and Nature of Goods
Q. Mr. Lambert ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 23*, 872.

Prisoners, Ireland
Muldowney and Finigan, Remission of Sentence
Qs. Mr. J. Roche, Mr. Dillon, Mr. S. MacNeill ; *As.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 20*, 664.

Prisons
Debtors, Number of, in Custody—Treatment, etc.
Q. Mr. J. A. Pease ; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *July 19*, 470.
Devizes Prison—Warder Hargrave's Pension, apportioning between Imperial and Local Funds, etc.
Q. Mr. Goulding ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 16*, 74.
Officials, Retiring Pensions—Memorial
Q. Mr. J. A. Pease ; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *July 23*, 875.
Reservists, Number of Warders and Guards—Alleged insufficient Staff at Portland, etc.
Q. Mr. J. A. Pease ; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *July 23*, 874.

Private Bill Legislation
Cost—Delay in presenting Return
Q. Mr. D. A. Thomas ; *A.* Mr. J. Collings, *July 17*, 235.

Pro-Boers
Position of
O. Mr. J. Chamberlain, *July 25*, 1195.

Processional Lights
Use of in the Church of England
Debate (Lords), *July 16*, 10.

Prohibition of Exportation of Arms Bill
l. 1R.* *July 20*, 635.
2R., *July 23*, 842.
*Com.** and *Rep.** *July 24*, 1010.
3R.* *July 26*, 1285.
c. 1R.* *July 26*, 1345.

Promotion Board
see Army.

Provand, Mr. A. D. [Glasgow, Blackfriars]
Naval Shipbuilding, Use of Non-inflammable Wood, *July 16*, 68.

Public Accounts Committee
Report, with Minutes of Evidence and Appendix Presented, *July 25*, 1162.

Public Houses, Ireland
Licences, New Licences, etc—Annual Return
Qs. Mr. M Healy; *As.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 23*, 879; *July 26*, 1337.

Public Institutions
Sunday Opening—Sale of Catalogues
Q. Mr. Massey-Mainwaring; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 16*, 86.

Public Libraries Bill
Petition, *July 18*, 342.

Public Petitions Committee
Report Presented, *July 25*, 1162.

Public Records
Ireland—Report Presented, *July 20*, 588, 640.

Public Schools
Army Commissions—Number allotted to Eton.
Q. Major Rasch; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 24*, 1048.

Public Works Board, Ireland
Assistant Surveyor of Buildings, Appointment of—Rejection of Mr. Carden
Q. Sir G. Fardell; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 19*, 475.

Public Works Loan Board
Annual Report Presented, *July 16*, 8, 56.

Public Works Loans Bill
c. Com., *July 23*, 979.

Public Works Loans Bill
Debate in Committee, *July 23*, 979.
Fitzgerald, J., Case of, 981, 982, 983.
Lambert, Mr., Case of, 980, 981.
Particulars of Loans, Poor Law Valuation, Names of Commissioner and Valuer, etc.—Setting out in the Bill suggested, 982, 983.
Recovery of Loans, 981, 982.
Restitution Fund, 982.

Quarries Bill
c. Bill Withdrawn, *July 26*, 1345.

Queen Anne's Bounty Board
Joint Committee of Inquiry — Report, *July 16*, 8, 92.

Queenstown
Police Landing Regulations — Asking American Passengers for Name and Destination, etc.
Q. Mr. Hayden; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 20*, 666.

Queen's Colleges, Ireland
Belfast—Report Presented, *July 24*, 988, 1040.
Cork—Report Presented, *July 18*, 342; *July 19*, 414.

Quinlan, James
Woolwich Arsenal, Claim for Compensation—Inquiry proposed
Q. Dr. Tanner; *A.* Mr. J. P. Williams, *July 26*, 1309.

Railway Bills
Group 8—Report from Committee, *July 18*, 342; *July 20*, 637.

Railway and Canal Traffic Acts Amendment Bill
c. 1R.* *July 20*, 673.

Railways
Bills relating to Railways, *see* their titles.
Capital, Traffic, Receipts, Working Expenditure, etc.—Return Presented, *July 16*, 7, 57.
Cattle carried by Rail, Providing Water for
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *July 23*, 873.
Continuous Brakes—Return Presented, *July 23*, 795, 848.
Foreign Countries, *see* their Names.
Fares
Great Northern Railway — Third Class Fare between Hornsey and King's Cross more than First Class
Q. Mr. Stephens; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *July 26*, 1321.
Suburban Fares—Return
Q. Mr. Stephens; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *July 26*, 1321.
Great Eastern Dispute—Arbitration, etc.
Qs. Mr. Trevelyan, Mr. E. Gray, Mr. Tennant; *As.* Mr. Ritchie, *July 26*, 1322.
Irish Questions
Amalgamation Bill—Establishment of Tribunal to settle Disputes
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 26*, 1339.
Clones Level Crossing and Platform—Inspector's Report
Q. Mr. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. J. Collings, *July 17*, 239.
Fishguard and Rosslare — Construction of Line between Cork and Fermoy
Q. Mr. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 26*, 1338.

[*cont.*

Railways—*cont.*
Irish Questions—*cont.*
Listowel-Ballybunion — Approximate Cost
Q. Mr. Flavin ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 16*, 80.
Listowel to Tarbert—Receiving Deputation with a view to giving Grant
Q. Mr. Flavin ; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 19*, 478.
Sligo and Northern Counties—Running Goods Wagons with Passenger Trains, Delays, etc.
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill ; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *July 23*, 882.
Sutton-Howth Tramway, *see* that title.
Sutton to Censure Railway, Method of Construction, etc.
Q. Mr. T. M. Healy ; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *July 26*, 1339.
Light Railways, Orders Presented, *July 20*, 588, 639.
(*see also* titles of Bills.)
Luggage, *see* that title.
Season Tickets, Issue of, to Third Class Passengers, proposed
Q. Mr. Stephens ; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *July 23*, 873.

Railways (Prevention of Accidents) Bill
c. Lords Amendts.* *July 19*, 584.

Rainfall
India, *see* that title—Monsoon, etc.

Ramsgate Corporation Improvements Bill
c. Reported with Amendts., *July 17*, 215.
*Con.** *July 23*, 845.
3R.* *July 26*, 1295.
l. Commons Amendts.* *July 27*, 1456.

Rangoon Outrage
Removal of Col. Rolland from Command
Q. Sir L. M'Iver ; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *July 24*, 1052.

Rasch, Major F. C. [Essex, S.E.]
Agricultural Holdings Bill, 3R., *July 19*, 537.
Army
Commissions and Public Schools—Number allotted to Eton, etc., *July 24*, 1048.
Leicesters, 1st Volunteer Battalion—Insufficient Supply of Rifles, *July 24*, 1048.
Militia Officers
Pay—Drawing Retired and Full Pay at the same time, *July 27*, 1507.
Sergeant-Majors—Warrant Rank, *July 27*, 1508.
Reserve of Stores, *July 27*, 1550.

Rasch, Major F. C.—*cont.*
Army—*cont.*
Sentry Duty in the Metropolis—Number of Men detailed for Guards, etc., *July 19*, 462.
Strength and Organisation of Military Forces, etc., *July 27*, 1551.
War Office—Reorganisation, etc., *July 27*, 1550.

Rates
see Local Taxation.

Rathfriland Postmastership
Appointment of Person Residing in Downpatrick Street
Q. Mr. Rentoul ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 17*, 239.

Rawmarsh Urban District Council (Tramways) Bill
*c. Con.** *July 17*, 215.
3R.* *July 20*, 636.
l. Commons Amendt.* *July 23*, 787.

Reading Clerk, House of Lords
see House of Lords.

Rebels in South Africa
see South African War.

Reckitt, Mr. H. J. [Lincolnshire, Brigg]
Post Office Sites (Re-committed) Bill, *Com.*, *July 18*, 389.

Records
Public Records, Ireland—Report Presented, *July 20*, 588.

Recruiting
see Army—Enlistment and Recruiting.

Redmond, Mr. J. E. [Waterford]
Education, Ireland—New Scheme—Opportunity for Discussion, *July 20*, 767, 769.
Irish Education Bill, 2R., *July 19*, 528, 531.
Irish Language, Teaching in Irish Schools—Teaching English through the Medium of Irish Language, etc., *July 20*, 682.
Proposed Motion for Adjournment of the House, *July 16*, 93.
Reformatory and Industrial Schools, Vote for, *July 20*, 782.

Redmond, Mr. W. H. K. [Clare, E.]
Intermediate Education (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *July 19*, 489, 510.
National School Teachers, Ireland—Monitors, Instruction, Gratuities, etc., *July 19*, 483.

Reformatory and Industrial Schools
Ireland, Vote for, *July 20*, 771—(*for* details of discussion, *see* Ireland).

Reformatory and Industrial Schools (Scotland) Bill
Bill Withdrawn, *July 16*, 188.

Registration of Firms Bill
c. Report from Select Committee, *July 17*, 240.

Reid, Sir R. T. [Dumfries Burghs]
Companies Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1072, 1076, 1088, 1090, 1093, 1103, 1112, 1118.
Liberal Leadership—Declaration, *July 25*, 1243.
South African War—Policy of the Government, Settlement after the War, Administration of Civil and Military Law, Punishment of Rebels, etc., *July 25*, 1179, 1188.

Religious Instruction in Schools
Pauper Children, *see* that title.

Removal and Settlement of Paupers
Poor Removal Bill, *see* that title.

Rentoul, Mr. J. A. [Down, E.]
Army—Formation of New Battalions, Band and Mess Expenses, *July 17*, 225.
Intermediate Education (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *July 19*, 508, 511, 514, 516.
Irish Language, Use of in Irish Schools in place of English, *July 20*, 691.
Rathfriland Postmastership — Appointment of Person Residing in Downpatrick Street, *July 17*, 239.

Reserve Forces
Australasia, *see* that title—Defence.

Reserve Forces Bill
c. 2R. *July 18*, 385.
Com., *July 23*, 965.
*Con.** and 3R.* *July 25*, 1162.
l. Commons Amendts.* *July 26*, 1269.

"Revenge," H.M.S.
Cordite Explosion—Inquiry, etc.
O. Adm. Field, *July*, *17*, 338; *Q.* Adm. Field; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *July 26*, 1310.

Rhodesia
Martial Law—Proclaimed Districts
Q. Capt. Sinclair; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *July 27*, 1501.

Rickmansworth and Uxbridge Valley Water Bill
l. Reported with Amendts., *July 24*, 985.
3R.* *July 27*, 1450.

Ridley, Rt. Hon. Sir M. W.—*Secretary of State for the Home Department* [Lancashire, Blackpool]
Arsenic, Reduction of—Report of Inquiry, *July 26*, 1318, 1319.
Burnley Miners—Mines Regulation Acts, Enforcing Check-weighing Clauses, etc., *July 26*, 1318.
Debtors in Prison—Number and Treatment, etc., *July 19*, 471.
London School Board Re-housing Schemes, *July 16*, 73.
Metropolitan Police Force—Deficiency in Strength, Supply of Recruits, etc., *July 19*, 471.
Prisons
Officials' Retiring Pension—Memorial, *July 23*, 875.
Warders—Number of Reservists withdrawn, alleged insufficient staff at Portland, *July 23*, 874.
Sheffield Laundry Prosecution—Contract with War Office, *July 23*, 875.
Teachers' Superannuation Act, Extending to Channel Islands and Isle of Man—Legislation, *July 16*, 72.
Vaccination Prosecutions—Case of F. J. Chatting, *July 16*, 72.

Rifle Clubs
Establishment of, as means of Defence
O. Sir C. Dilke, *July 17*, 272.
Formation of—Government Allowances
Q. Mr. Goddard; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 20*, 648.
Ireland, Establishment of Rifle Clubs, proposed — Irish Marksmen at Bisley
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 20*, 665.

Rifle Ranges
Kilworth—Acquisition of adjoining Land
Q. Mr. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. J. P. Williams, *July 23*, 860.
Military Lands Act, 1892—Purchase of Land by County and Borough Councils, etc.
Q. Captain Sinclair; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 23*, 859.
Military Lands Bill, *see* that title.

Rifles
Efficient Rifles, Supply of, at Home and in South Africa
O. Mr. Warner, *July 27*, 1585.
Leicesters, 1st Volunteer Battalion—Insufficient Supply of Rifles
Q. Major Rasch; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 24*, 1048.

Right of Appeal
Monaghan Petty Sessions — Right of Appeal Refused to M'Guigan and Hughes, etc.
Q. Mr. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 16*, 81.

Rio de Janeiro
Trade Report Presented, *July 17*, 192.

Ritchie, Rt. Hon. C. T.—*President of the Board of Trade* [Croydon]
Coal
Exportation of to Foreign Countries, British and American Exports—Statistics, *July 20*, 654.
Rise in Prices, Export of Coal to Foreign Countries, etc., *July 27*, 1511.
Companies Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1065, 1066, 1070, 1072, 1073, 1074, 1086, 1089, 1090, 1095, 1098, 1099, 1102, 1105, 1106, 1107, 1108, 1109, 1111, 1125, 1129, 1131, 1140, 1155, 1157, 1159, 1160.
Marine Biological Association—Plymouth Laboratory — Stockholm Conference, etc., *July 26*, 1319, 1320.
Railways
Cattle Carried by Rail, Providing Water for, etc., *July 23*, 873.
Fares
Great Northern Railway—Fares Between Hornsey and King's Cross, *July 26*, 1321.
Suburban Fares—Return, *July 26*, 1322.
Great Eastern Dispute—Arbitration, etc., *July 26*, 1322.
Passengers' Luggage
Amount of Free Luggage, etc., *July 26*, 1321.
Correspondence Relating to, Laying on the Table, *July 20*, 653.
Season Tickets—Issue of, to Third Class Passengers, proposed, *July 23*, 874.
Sligo and Northern Counties Railway Goods Wagons, Running with Passenger Trains, Delays, etc., *July 23*, 882.
Sutton-Howth Tramway, laying by the side of the Road instead of on the Road, etc., *July 23*, 881, 882.
Water Gas, Use of—Recommendations of Departmental Committee, etc., *July 20*, 653, 654.

Ritualism in the Church
Continued Lawlessness in spite of Decision of the Archbishops, etc.
Debate (Lords) *July 16*, 10.
Chester Diocese—Use of Incense, 13.
Communion—Disobedience to the Rubric, 14.
Decision of the two Archbishops, 11.
English Church Union and the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, 16.
Exeter Diocese—Use of Incense, 13.

Ritualism in the Church—*cont.*
Continued Lawlessness, etc.—*cont.*
Debate (Lords)—*cont.*
Incense—Condemned as Illegal, 10.
Legal Proceedings — Proposed Fund for Expenses, 18.
Memorial and Deputation to the Archbishop of Canterbury, 11.
Processional Lights—Condemned as Illegal, 11.
St. Mary Magdalene, Paddington, High Mass, 13.

River Floods
Dromore—Complaints
Q. Mr. Daly; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 26*, 1331.

Roads
Ireland—Traction Engines on, Maintenance of Roads, etc.
Q. Mr. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 19*, 476.
Scotland—Lewis, Delay in making Roads
Q. Mr. Caldwell; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *July 23*, 876.

Roberts, Mr. J. B. [Carnarvonshire, Eifion]
South African War
Boer Women and Children sent to the Enemy's Lines, *July 27*, 1628.
Expenditure—Comparisons with Boer Expenditure, *July 27*, 1628.

Roberts, Mr. H. J. [Denbighshire, W.]
Agricultural Holdings Bill, 3R., *July 19*, 558.
China—Anti-Foreign Rising
Indian Troops for China, Hospital and Medical Arrangements, *July 26*, 1299.
Japanese Troops, Number landed in China, etc., *July 19*, 455.
Indian Army—Troops Withdrawn from Establishment for Service outside India—British Troops, Number Withdrawn, etc., *July 20*, 643.
Indian Budget—Famine, Imperial Grant Irrigation Works, etc., *July 26*, 1405.

Roberts, N.
Nonconformist Pupil Teacher at Holyhead National School—Managers refusing to sign Memorandum of Agreement, etc.
Q. Mr. E. J. Griffith; *A.* Sir J. Gorst, *July 24*, 1055.

Robertson, Mr. E. [Dundee]
Army
Officers—Money Competency, "No man but a rich man can enter the Army," Cavalry "Scandal," etc *July 27*, 1614.

Robertson, Mr. E.—*cont.*
Army—*cont.*
Supplementary Estimate—Total Expenditure for the Year, etc., *July 27*, 1610.
Navy—Water-tube Boilers, Alarming Growth of Shipbuilding Vote, etc., *July 17*, 328.
South African War
Inquiry into Conduct of the War, etc., *July 27*, 1611, 1613.
Stores Transferred from Navy to Land Service—Return, *July 24*, 1047; *July 27*, 1611.
Tithe Rent-charge (Ireland) Bill, 3R., *July 16*, 117; *Re-com.*, *July 16*, 149.

Rochdale Corporation Bill
l. Report from Committee of Selection, *July 16*, 3; *July 17*, 191.

Roche, Mr. J. [Galway, E.]
Irish Convicts—Cases of Muldowney and Finigan, Remission of Sentence proposed, *July 20*, 664.

Rockhall and Rochford House
Religious Instruction for Children—Non-appointment of Church of England Chaplain by Willesden Board of Guardians, etc.
Q. Mr. Talbot; *A.* Mr. Chaplin, *July 17*, 232.

Roe's Patent Bill
c. 2R.* *July 18*, 341.
Reported without Amendts., *July 24*, 1038.
3R.* *July 27*, 1496.
Standing Orders, *July 23*, 846.

Rolland, Col.
Removal from Command at Rangoon
Q. Sir L. M'Iver; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *July 24*, 1052.

Rollit, Sir A. K. [Islington, S.]
Companies Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1077, 1087.

Roman Catholic Chaplain
Navy—Proposal under Consideration
Q. Capt. Donelan; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *July 27*, 1510.

Rose-Innes, Mr.
see South African War—Settlement after the War.

Rosebery, Earl of
Strength and Organisation of Home Defences, *July 27*, 1468.

Rossavally Tenantry
Purchase of Holding—Interest in Lieu of Rent
Q. Mr. Doogan; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 26*, 1336.

Rosslare
Railway—Construction of Line between Cork and Fermoy
Q. Mr. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 26*, 1338.

Rotherham Corporation Bill
*c. Con.** *July 20*, 636.
3R.* *July 24*, 1038.
l. Commons Amendts.* *July 26*, 1267.

Rotherhithe and Ratcliff Tunnel Bill
c. Reported with Amendts., *July 16*, 55.
*Con.** *July 23*, 845.

Royal Artillery
see Army—Artillery.

Royal Irish Academy
see Ireland—Academy.

Royal Irish Constabulary
see Constabulary, Royal Irish.

Royal Irish Rifles
Command
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 27*, 1503.

Royal Marines
see Marines.

Royal Reserve Battalions
see Army.

Royal University, Ireland
Account of Receipts and Expenditure Presented, *July 27*, 1498.

Rural Schools
Educational Grants—Differential Treatment in Rural and Urban Schools Motion (Lord Heneage), *July 24*, 1024.

Rural Postmen
Shelters—Relieving Postmen of Responsibility
Q. Mr. Steadman; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 27*, 1518.

Russell, Gen. F. S. [Cheltenham]
South African War
Boots for the Troops—Inadequate Supply alleged, *July 19*, 459.
Tugela Engagement—Col. Long's Explanation, Publication of, *July 19*, 459.

Russell, Mr. T. W.—*Secretary to the Local Government Board* [Tyrone, S.]
Deportation of Irish Paupers—Case of J. Jones, *July 16*, 78.
Gas Order Confirmation (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *July 17*, 212, 213, 214.
Hove Recreation Ground—Raising Loan, etc., *July 27*, 1514.
Local Taxation Returns, *July 27*, 1514.

Russia
Eggs Imported to Ireland—Exportation to England as Irish Eggs
Qs. Mr. Field, Mr. P. O'Brien; *As.* Mr. Plunkett, *July 20*, 670.
St. Petersburg, *see* that title.

Sailing Training Squadron
see Navy—Training Squadron.

Saint David's Railway (Abandonment) Bill
l. Reported without Amendt., *July 27*, 1449.

St. David's Railway (Additional Powers) Bill
l. Bill not to be proceeded with, *July 24*, 985.

St. Petersburg
Herring Trade—Facilities for Discharge and Storage
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *July 16*, 71.

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday Bill
Petitions, *July 16*, 55; *July 18*, 342; *July 19*, 452; *July 23*, 847.

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children (No. 2) Bill
Petitions, *July 16*, 56; *July 17*, 216; *July 18*, 342; *July 19*, 452; *July 20*, 639; *July 23*, 847; *July 24*, 1039; *July 25*, 1162.

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children (Scotland) Bill
Petitions, *July 16*, 56; *July 19*, 452; *July 20*, 639

Salford
Volunteer Engineer Corps, Formation of, *see* Lancashire.

Salford Corporation Bill
c. Reported with Amendts., *July 24*, 1039.

Salisbury, Marquess of—*Prime Minister and Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs*
Burden of Empire—Resources and Obligations of the British Empire, *July 20*, 617.
China
Anti-Foreign Rising—Papers, *July 23*, 796.
Burden of Defending British Position, *July 20*, 617.
Indian Expenditure—Report of Royal Commission, *July 20*, 616.
Merchant Shipping (Liability of Shipowners and others) Bill, 3R., *July 20*, 620.

Salisbury, Marquess of—*cont.*
Ritualism in the Church—Disobedience of the Clergy, *July 16*, 25.
Strength and Organisation of Home Defences, *July 27*, 1463.

Salisbury's, Lord, Primrose League Speech
see Primrose League Meeting.

Samuel, Mr. J. [Stockton]
Post Office Sites (Re-committed) Bill, *Com.*, *July 18*, 389, 398.
Public Works Loans Bill, *Com.*, *July 23*, 982.

Sandhurst, Lord
Indian Famine—Monsoon, Rainfall, etc., *July 16*, 9.

Sands, J.
Farm near Listowel, Protection of—Number of Police employed, Cost, etc.
Q. Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 19*, 478.

Sandys, Col. T. M. [Lancashire, Bootle]
Volunteers Bill, *Com.*, *July 23*, 957.

Sardinia
Trade Report Presented, *July 17*, 792.

Sassoon, Sir E. [Hythe]
Imperial Telegraphic Communication—Committee of Inquiry, *July 23*, 867, 868.
Warren, Mr., Consul General at Shanghai—Appointment as Chargé d'Affaires, *July 24*, 1040, 1041.

Savings Banks and Friendly Societies Bill
c. Bill Withdrawn, *July 16*, 187.

Scarborough Corporation Bill
l. Reported with Amendts., *July 23*, 785.

School Attendance
see Education—Attendance.

School Boards
Wimbledon Proposal, Ratepayers' Resolution, etc.
Q. Mr. Price; *A.* Sir J. Gorst, *July 24*, 1055.

Science and Art Directory
Attendance of Science and Art Scholars—London Board Schools' Duplicate Registration
Q. Mr. E. Cecil; *A.* Sir J. Gorst, *July 24*, 1057.

Science and Art Directory—*cont.*
New Regulations and Alterations
Clause 6—Alteration, Effect of, on School Board Classes and the Education Department Grant
Q. Mr. J. A. Pease; *A.* Sir J. Gorst, *July 27*, 1516.
Inspectors of Schools' Correspondence, etc.
Q. Mr. Harwood; *A.* Sir J. Gorst, *July 27*, 1515.
Opportunity for Discussion
Q. Mr. Harwood; *A.* Sir J. Gorst, *July 27*, 1515.
Pupil Teachers—Effect of New Regulations on
Q. Mr. Harwood; *A.* Sir J. Gorst, *July 27*, 1516.
Regulations becoming Lawful and Operative without being laid on the Table, etc.
Q. Mr. Harwood; *A.* Sir J. Gorst, *July 27*, 1515.

Scoble, Sir A. R. [Hackney, Central]
Loyalists' Losses in Natal, Compensation for, *July 17*, 220.

Scotland
Secretary—Rt. Hon. Lord Balfour of Burleigh.
Lord Advocate—Rt. Hon. A. G. Murray.
Army Recruits—Number joined in 1899 and 1900
Q. Mr. Shee; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 26*, 1306.
Avoch Harbour Accommodation, Improvement of—Grant-in-aid, proposed
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *July 16*, 78.
Bills relating to Scotland, *see* their titles.
Channel Fleet—Visit to Invergordon, proposed
Q. Mr. Caldwell; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *July 23*, 862.
Death Certification—Eight per cent. of Uncertified Burials
O. Lord Monkswell, *July 17*, 209.
Education—*for* collective heading, *see* Education.
Fee Grant—Annual Payments on basis of Equivalent Grants
Q. Mr. Caldwell; *A.* Sir M. H. Beach, *July 17*, 236.
Inver Water Supply—Delay in completing Works
Q. Mr. Caldwell; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *July 23*, 877.
Lewis, Island of, *see* that title.
Post Office Questions, *see* Post Office.
Roads—Delay in Construction in the Island of Lewis
Q. Mr. Caldwell; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *July 23*, 876.

Scotland—*cont.*
Sheriff Court Procedure—Committee Report
Q. Mr. Wallace; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *July 26*, 1330.
University
Fees—Return
Q. Mr. T. Shaw; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *July 20*, 659.
Return Ordered, *July 23*, 849.
General Report of Commissioners Presented, *July 23*, 795, 848.
Whisky in Bond—Return Presented, *July 19*, 452.

Scott, Mr. C. P. [Lancashire, Leigh]
India
Cholera Outbreak—Additional Medical Officers, etc., *July 19*, 467; *July 20*, 652.
Famine
Cattle, Mortality among—Funds Available for Supply of Fodder, Seed Grain, etc., *July 19*, 467; *July 23*, 864.
Loans to Native States, *July 23*, 865.
Number of Persons Relieved, etc., *July 23*, 864.
South African War—Boer Women sent to Enemy's Lines, *July 20*, 646; *July 23*, 858.
Volunteers Bill, *Com.*, *July 23*, 936, 937.

Scouting
Training in
Os. Sir H. Vincent, *July 27*, 1574; Col. Welby, 1603.

Sea Fisheries Bill
c. Reported without Amendts., *July 19*, 486.

Seamen's Fund Winding-up Act
Account of Receipt and Expenditure Presented, *July 16*, 8, 57.

Season Tickets
Railway Companies Issuing Season Tickets to Third Class Passengers, proposed
Q. Mr. Stephens; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *July 23*, 873.

Secondary Education Bill
see Education Bill.

Secretary of State for War
Attack on, *see* War Office—Administration.

Seely, Mr. C. H. [Lincoln]
South African War—Despatches, Publication of, Volunteers and Imperial Yeomanry Invalided Home, etc., *July 27*, 1598.
Volunteers—Garrison Duty, Offer of Services, etc., *July 24*, 1046.
Volunteers Bill, 2R., *July 18*, 379.

Sentry Duty
London—Number of men detailed for Sentry-go, etc.
Q. Major Rasch; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 19*, 462.

Service Voters
County and Borough Franchise Assimilation (London) Bill, *July 17*, 194, 195.

Seymour, Admiral
see China—Anti-Foreign Rising.

Shannon Water and Electric Power Bill
l. Report from Committee of Selection, *July 23*, 788; *July 24*, 987; *July 26*, 1267.
2R., *July 23*, 789.
Witnesses Ordered to attend Select Committee, *July 24*, 985.
Standing Orders, *July 16*, 1.

Shannon Water and Electric Power Bill
Debate on Second Reading, etc., *July 23*, 789.
Fisheries Inspector's Report
Q. Earl of Mayo; *A.* Earl of Denbigh, *July 23*, 841.
Objections to the Bill, 789, 792, 794.
Riparian Owners' Rights—Compensation for Loss of Water, etc., 790, 794.

Shaw, Mr. T. [Hawick Burghs]
University Fees, Scotland—Return, *July 20*, 659.

Shebeens
Ireland—Return Presented, *July 23*, 848.

Shee, Mr. J. J. [Waterford, W.]
Army
Recruits—Number joined in Great Britain and Ireland in 1899 and 1900, etc., *July 26*, 1306.
Reservists' Pay and Allowances, etc., Increase in, *July 26*, 1303.
Intermediate Education (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *July 19*, 523.
Irish Language, Use of, in Irish Schools in place of English, *July 20*, 763.

Sheffield
Victoria Laundry Prosecution—Contract with War Office
Q. Mr. Tennant; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *July 23*, 875.

Sheffield Bye-law
Resignation of Members of County Council—Meath County Council
Q. Mr. T. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 26*, 1338.

Sheffield Corporation Bill
c. Report from Select Committee on Police and Sanitary Regulations Bills, *July 26*, 1296.

Sheringham
Delay in Delivery of Letters—Disorganisation of London Post Office
Q. Sir G. Fardell; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 23*, 870.

Shipbuilding
Construction of Ironclads and Torpedo Boats for the Chinese by British Firms—Legislation
Q. Colonel Pilkington; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 23*, 853; *Q.* Colonel Pilkington; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *July 24*, 1041.
Naval Programme, *see* Navy.

Shirt Contracts
Army Contracts—Total Number supplied for Troops in South Africa, Non-acceptance of Tenders from Irish Firms, etc.
Q. Mr. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. J. P. Williams, *July 23*, 861.

Sidmouth, Viscount
Dock Accommodation for Naval Ships—New Works, etc., *July 17*, 207, 208.

Silver Coinage
Crowns and Double Florins—Continuing Coinage of
Q. Mr. F. D. Smith; *A.* Sir M. H Beach, *July 19*, 469.

Sinclair, Capt. J. [Forfar]
Army Supplementary Estimate—War Expenditure, etc., *July 27*, 1590.
Cape Colony Ministerial Crisis—Papers relating to, Laying before the House, *July 16*, 63.
Military Lands Act, 1892—Purchases of Land by County and Borough Councils, etc., *July 23*, 859.
Reserve Forces Bill, 2R., *July 18*, 386.
South African War
Boer Prisoners sent to Ceylon—Number, etc., *July 23*, 857.
Censorship of Letters and Telegrams, *July 27*, 1594, 1620.
Martial Law in Cape Colony and Rhodesia, *July 27*, 1501.
Despatches, Publication of, *July 16*, 62.
Holding back Information, etc., *July 27*, 1593.
Newspapers, Prohibition of, under Martial Law, *July 27*, 1597.
Soldier Settlers after the War, Annual Cost of Garrison in South Africa etc., *July 27*, 1591.
Volunteers Bill, 2R., *July 18*, 377, 384; *Com.*, *July 23*, 925, 949, 953, 959, 962, 963.

Sinclair, Mr. L. [Essex, Romford]
Vaccination Prosecution—Case of F. J. Chatting, *July 16*, 72.

Sisters of Nazareth
South Denes Volunteer Camp — Col. Brownrigg prohibiting Visits and Collections
Qs. Dr. Tanner; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 19*, 458; *July 20*, 648; *July 24*, 1047.

Sittings and Adjournments of the House
Standing Orders, Suspension of
Motion (Mr. A. J. Balfour), *July 16*, 95.

Sligo and Northern Counties Railway
Goods Wagons Running with Passenger Trains—Delays, etc.
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *July 23*, 882.

Smith, Mr. S. [Flintshire]
Indian Budget—Famine, Imperial Grant, etc., *July 26*, 1434.

Smith, Mr. W. F. D. [Strand, Westminster]
Silver Coinage—Issue of Crowns and Double Florins, *July 19*, 469.
Victoria and Albert Museum—Examination for Assistantships, *July 17*, 235.

Sneem
Extra Police Force—Protection of Mr. Warden's House, etc.
Qs. Mr. Flavin, Mr. Flynn; *As.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 19*, 481.
Pier—Erection of Goods Store, Mr. Warden's Objections
Q. Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Plunkett, *July 20*, 669.
Teacher's Residence Site
Q. Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 20*, 662.

Soames, Mr. A. W. [Norfolk, S.]
Army Head-gear—Death of Private W. Ward at Yarmouth from Sunstroke, alleged, *July 26*, 1305.
Foot and Mouth Disease Regulations in Norfolk, *July 16*, 76.

Soldiers
Discharged Soldiers — Treatment of Private R. Weir, Removal from Netley Hospital to Enniskillen Workhouse — Cause of Insanity, etc.
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 16*, 65.
Old Age Pensions
O. Sir J. Colomb, *July 27*, 1553.
Settlement of Soldiers in South Africa after the War, *see* South African War —Soldiers.
Workmen's Compensation Act, *see* that title—Army and Navy Services, etc.

South African War
Administration of South Africa after the War, *see* sub-heading Settlement.
Afrikander Bond
Loyalty of
Os. Mr. S. Buxton, *July 25*, 1169; Mr. J. Chamberlain, 1190.
"Treasonable Conspiracy"
O. Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 25*, 1202.
After the War, *see* sub-heading Settlement after the War.
Artillery—Reserves of Artillery and Ammunition on Outbreak of the War
Q. Mr. Yerburgh; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 24*, 1045.
Australian Assistance
Os. Lord Brassey, *July 19*, 436; Marquess of Lansdowne, 442.
Bloemfontein Hospital Arrangements, *see* sub-heading Hospital and Medical Arrangements.
Boer Prisoners, *see* sub-heading Prisoners.
Boer Women sent to Enemy's Lines —Proclamation, etc.
Qs. Mr. C. P. Scott; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 20*, 646; *July 23*, 858.
O. Mr. B. Roberts, *July 27*, 1628.
Qs. Dr. Tanner, Sir W. Lawson; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 24*, 1044.
Q. Dr. Tanner; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 26*, 1303.
Boers in British Hospitals—Number, Treatment, etc
Q. Mr. H. D. Greene; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 19*, 456.
Boots for the Troops—Inadequate Supply, Lord Roberts' Telegram
Q. Gen. Russell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 19*, 459.
Botha, Mr. J., Arrest of, in Cape Colony
Q. Sir W. Lawson; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *July 16*, 63.
British Forces
Number of Troops in South Africa
Wyndham's, Mr., Statement, *July 27*, 1530.
Reinforcements—Statistics
Qs. Mr. Lloyd-George, Mr. S. MacNeill; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 20*, 646.
British Prisoners, *see* sub-heading Prisoners.
British Reverses, *see* sub-heading Surrender, etc.
Canadian Contingent, Officers' Bravery—Loss of two Distinguished Officers
O. Marquess of Lansdowne, *July 19*, 442.
Cape Colony
Martial Law, *see* that sub-heading.
Rebels, *see* that sub-heading.
Sanitary Arrangements, Sir W. Foster's Suggestions, etc., *see* sub-heading Hospital and Medical Arrangements.

South African War—*cont.*

Casualties
British Casualties in June
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 27*, 1501.
Delay in Notification of Deaths of Soldiers, *see* sub-heading Notification of Deceased Soldiers; *also* sub-heading Surrender of British Troops.

Censorship of Letters and Telegrams
Os. Sir H. Vincent, *July 27*, 1575; Capt. Sinclair, *July 27*, 1594; Mr. Wyndham, *July 27*, 1619.
Censorship of Letters during the Siege of Ladysmith
O. Sir C. Dilke, *July 27*, 1544.
Joubert's, Gen., Telegram of Condolence to Lady Symons
Os. Capt. Sinclair, *July 27*, 1596: Mr. Wyndham, 1620.
Natal Correspondence—Return Presented, *July 24*, 1040.
Suppression of Telegram from Meeting held at Westminster Palace Hotel
Os. Capt. Sinclair, *July 27*, 1595; Mr. Wyndham, 1620.

Chamberlain's, Mr., Policy, *see* sub-heading Policy of the Government.

Chaplains—Insufficient Supply
Q. Lord H. Cecil; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 19*, 462.

Civil Surgeons, *see* sub-heading Hospital and Medical Arrangements.

Colenso Engagement—Col. Long's Explanation, *see* sub-heading Tugela Engagement.

Colonial Contingents — Further Correspondence, relating to, Presented, *July 16*, 7, 56.

Comforts for the Troops, *see* sub-heading Gifts.

Commissariat — Troops half starved, alleged
O. Mr. Wason, *July 27*, 1577.

Cost and Finance of the War
Expenditure compared with the Expenditure of the Transvaal
O. Mr. B. Roberts, *July 27*, 1629.
Ireland—Amount contributed towards the War
Q. Capt. Donelan; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 23*, 856.
O. Mr. T. M. Healy, *July 27*, 1637.
Supplementary Estimate
Approximate Amount
Q. Capt. Donelan; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 23*, 856.
Wyndham's, Mr., Statement, *July 27*, 1525.

County Councils, Members of, at the Front, Loss of Office, etc.
Members of Local Authorities Relief Bill, *see* that title.

South African War—*cont.*

Deceased Soldiers
Money due to—Payment to Relatives
O. Mr. Dalziel, *July 27*, 1607.
Notifications, *see* that sub-heading.

Despatches—Publication
O. Mr. Wyndham, *July 27*, 1623.
Laying on the Table before Discussion on the Supplementary Estimate
Q. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 23*, 855.
Non-publication of, Re-written Despatches, etc.
O. Mr. S. MacNeill, *July 27*, 1631.
Paardeberg, Bloemfontein, Ladysmith, etc.
Qs. Capt. Sinclair, Mr. S. MacNeill; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 16*, 62.
Withholding Information
Os. Sir. H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 27*, 1556; Capt. Sinclair, *July 27*, 1593.
(*see also* sub-headings Names of Engagements, etc.)

Discharged Soldiers, Treatment of—Case of Private R. Weir
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 16*, 65.

Disfranchisement of Rebels, *see* sub-heading Rebels.

Enteric Fever
Hospital and Medical Arrangements
O. Sir W. Foster, *July 27*, 1565.
Inoculation against
Inquiry into Results by South African Hospitals Commission
Q. Col. W. Murray; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 23*, 854.
Results among Officers and Men—Statement of Director-General of Army Medical Department
Q. Mr. Channing; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 24*, 1045.
Ladysmith—Number of Admissions to Hospital, Number of Deaths, etc.
Q. Sir W. Foster; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 16*, 65.

Expenditure, *see* sub-heading Cost and Finance of the War.

Free State Annexation, Lord Roberts' Proclamation
O. Mr. Labouchere, *July 25*, 1227.

Garrison, Permanent British Garrison, *see* sub-heading Settlement after the War.

German Criticism
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *July 27*, 1547; Sir H. Vincent, 1575.

Gifts for the Troops — Non-delivery of Parcels for Imperial Yeomanry
Q. Mr. H. S. Foster; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 26*, 1302.

South African War—*cont.*
Government Policy, *see* sub-heading Policy of the Government.
Guns, Erosion of, by Cordite—Committee of Inquiry
Qs. Sir C. Dilke, Mr. Paulton; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 17*, 226.
Hardships—Troops half starved, alleged
O. Mr. Wason, *July 27*, 1577.
Honnen Spruit Disaster, Despatch of ex-prisoners to guard Spruit—Want of Equipment, etc.
Q. Capt. Norton; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 26*, 1302.
Horses
Lessons of the War
Os. Lord Tweedmouth, *July 17*, 204; Marquess of Lansdowne, 206.
Supply of Remounts, etc.
Os. Lord Tweedmouth, *July 17*, 204; Marquess of Lansdowne, 206; Sir C. Dilke, *July 27*, 1547; Mr. Wyndham, 1624.
Hospitals
Boers in British Hospitals—Number, Treatment, etc.
Q. Mr. H. D. Greene; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 19*, 456.
Number of Men in Hospital from Causes other than Wounds
Q. Mr. Maddison; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 23*, 858.
Hospital and Medical Arrangements
O. Mr. Burdett-Coutts, *July 27*, 1567
Debate in Com. of Supply, *July 27*, 1564
Civil Surgeons
Number Employed—Number of Army Medical Officers under Two Years' Service, etc.
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 16*, 64.
Pledge of Secrecy
Qs. Dr. Farquharson, Mr. Burdett-Coutts, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 20*, 643; *Q.* Dr. Farquharson; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 26*, 1301; *Q.* Dr. Tanner; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 27*, 1502; *Q.* Dr. Tanner; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 27*, 1506.
Commission of Inquiry
Os. Earl of Aberdeen, Marquess of Lansdowne, *July 19*, 448.
Additional Members
O. Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 17*, 222.
Constitution of—Opportunity for Discussion
Qs. Mr. Burdett-Coutts, Mr. S. MacNeill; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, Mr. Speaker, *July 17*, 222.
South African War—*cont.*
Hospital and Medical Arrangements—*cont.*
Commission of Inquiry—*cont.*
Constitution of, etc.—*cont.*
Motion for Adjournment of the House, proposed—Speaker's Decision, *July 17*, 222.
Cunningham's, Prof., Appointment
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 16*, 61.
Enteric Fever, Innoculation against—Inquiry into Results, proposed
Q. Col. W. Murray; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 23*, 854.
Harrison, Mr., Appointment of—Member of Army Railway Council
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 23*, 885.
Powers to enforce Attendance of Witnesses—Protection of Witnesses, etc.
Qs. Mr. Pickersgill, Mr. S. MacNeill, Mr. Burdett-Coutts; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 24*, 1042.
Warrant of Prime Minister, Lord Justice Romer's Statement, etc.
Qs. Mr. S. MacNeill, Mr. Pickersgill; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 26*, 1299.
Medicines and Instruments, quality of, etc.
O. Mr. Warner, *July 27*, 1585.
Nurses, Number of Deaths—Request for more Doctors and Nurses
Q. Dr. Tanner; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 24*, 1044.
Sanitary Conditions Inquiry
Q. Sir W. Foster; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 27*, 1499.
Indian Contingent—Return to India
O. Sir C. Dilke, *July 27*, 1540.
Inquiry into Surrender of Prisoners, etc., *see* sub-heading Surrender.
Invalided Officers and Men—Number invalided home, Number of Deaths, etc.
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 19*, 460.
Invalided Volunteers and Imperial Yeomanry, Treatment of, by the War Office
O. Mr. Seely, *July 27*, 1599.
Johannesburg
Court of Chief Magistrate Tribunal, etc.
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *July 19*, 461.
Resumption of Industrial Occupations
Q. Mr. Kimber; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *July 27*, 1500.

Sou African War—*cont.*

Koornspruit Disaster

Despatches, Publication of—Charges of Concealment
O. Mr Wyndham, *July 27*, 1622, 1625.

Officer Responsible for failure to communicate with Col. Broadwood
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 27*, 1500.

Ladysmith

Enteric Fever—Number of Admissions to Hospital and Number of Deaths, etc.
Q. Sir W. Foster; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 16*, 65.

White's, Sir G., Despatches, Publication of
Qs. Capt. Sinclair, Mr. S. MacNeill; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 16*, 62.

Lessons of the War

Army Medical Department, *see* Army.

Dilke, Sir C., on, *July 27*, 1541.

Reconstruction of the War Office and Reorganisation of the Army Debate (Lords), *July 17*, 196.

Wyndham's, Mr., Statement, *July 27*, 1526.

Letters—Censorship, *see* that sub-heading.

Liberal Party

Attitude of Certain Members, Effect of on Prolonging the War
O. Mr. J. Chamberlain, *July 25*, 1199.

Liberal Party and their Leadership
Os. Mr. A. J. Balfour, Sir R. Reid, *July 25*, 1243.

Lindley Disaster

Inquiry into Surrender of Troops
Q. Mr. Kimber; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 27*, 1501.

Treatment of Prisoners by the Boers, etc.
Os. Mr. Kimber, *July 27*, 1609; Mr. Wyndham, 1627.

Loyal and Disloyal Dutch
O. Mr. J. Chamberlain, *July 25*, 1189.

Loyalists' Losses in Natal, Compensation for — Payment out of Colonial Funds, etc.
Q. Sir A. Scoble; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *July 17*, 220.

Magazine, Attempt to blow up, *see* sub-heading Pretoria.

Martial Law Administration — Cape Colony, etc.
Os. Mr. S. Buxton, *July 25*, 1171; Mr. A. Elliot, 1178; Sir R. Reid, 1179; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 1235.

Civil Prisons, Detention of Persons in, Number detained, etc.
Qs. Mr. Humphreys-Owen; *As.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *July 16*, 64; *July 17*, 221.

South African War—*cont.*

Martial Law Administration — Cape Colony, etc.—*cont.*

Date of last Trial for Treasonable Offences
Q. Mr. Buchanan; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *July 16*, 63.

Miscarriage of Justice, alleged—Case of Mr. J. Botha
Q. Sir W. Lawson; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *July 16*, 63.

Proclaimed Districts—Cape Colony and Rhodesia
Q. Capt. Sinclair; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *July 27*, 1501.

Proclamation by Civil and Military Authorities — Withdrawal of, etc.
Q. Mr. Humphreys-Owen; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *July 26*, 1301.

Rebels, *see* that sub-heading.

Medals

Colonial Troops, Rumours as to Separate Medal
Q. Lord Carrington; *A.* Marquess of Lansdowne, *July 26*, 1289.

Distributing Medals immediately on the conclusion of the War
O. Lord Strathcona and Mount Royal, *July 26*, 1290.

Medical Comforts—British Medical Comforts for the Boers—Treatment of British Prisoners
Q. Mr. Kimber; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 27*, 1502.

Medical and Sanitary Arrangements, *see* sub-headings Hospital and Medical Arrangements, and Sanitary Arrangements.

Milner, Sir A.

Labouchere's, Mr., Attack on, *July 25*, 1225.

Natal—Censorship of Letters, etc., *see* sub-heading Censorship.

Naval Stores Borrowed by the Army, etc. —Return
Q. Mr. E. Robertson; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 24*, 1047; *O.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 27*, 1611.

Return Presented, *July 24*, 988, 1040.

New South Wales Field Hospital
O. Mr. Burdett-Coutts, *July 27*, 1570.

Newspapers—Prohibition of, under Martial Law
O. Captain Sinclair, *July 27*, 1597.

Nicholson's Nek Disaster
Os. Mr. E. Robertson, *July 27*, 1613.

Nitral's Nek Disaster
O. Sir C. Dilke, 1546.

Notification of Deceased Soldiers, Delay in Notifying—Case of Sergeant French and Private Martin
Q. Mr. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 16*, 66.

South African War—*cont.*
Officers ordered Home
Justice Denied
O. Mr. T. M. Healy, *July 27*, 1635.
Officers taking Command of high positions, etc.
O. Mr. Bartley, *July 27*, 1589.
Orange River Colony—Nurses, Number of Deaths, etc.
Q. Dr. Tanner; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 24*, 1044.
Paardeberg—Publication of Despatches
Qs. Captain Sinclair, Mr. S. MacNeill; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 16*, 62.
Parcels — Non-delivery of, to Imperial Yeomanry
Q. Mr. H. S. Foster; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 26*, 1302.
Pay of Soldiers
Colonial Soldiers' Pay—Higher Rate of Pay than English Soldiers
O. Mr. Dalziel, *July 27*, 1608.
Delay in Paying, alleged
O. Mr. Warner, *July 27*, 1587.
Policy of the Government, Attack on—Debate in Com. of Supply, *July 25*, 1168, 1199, 1243.
Chamberlain's, Mr., Defence, 1186.
Necessity for a Clear Issue, 1187.
No Neutral Ground, 1187.
Chamberlain's, Mr., Motives — Suspicions
Os. Mr. S. Buxton, *July 25*, 1168; Mr. J. Chamberlain, 1196; Mr. Lloyd-George, 1200.
Grey, Sir E., on the "Merits" of the War, *July 25*, 1251.
Pretoria
Boer Women sent over to the Enemy's Lines, *see* sub-heading Boer Women.
Magazine, Attempt to blow up—Lieut. Tossel and Mr. S. Gillingham condemned to Death
Qs. Mr. P. O'Brien; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 17*, 224; *July 24*, 1043.
Prisoners
Boer Prisoners
Ceylon, Despatch of Prisoners to —Number, etc.
Q. Capt. Sinclair; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 23*, 857.
Medical Comforts, *see* that sub-heading.
British Prisoners
Pretoria Prisoners—Treatment
Q. Mr. Lloyd-George; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 20*, 646.
Surrender, etc., *see* that sub-heading.
Yeomanry—Lindley Disaster
Os. Mr. Kimber, *July 27*, 1609; Mr. Wyndham, 1627.

South African War—*cont.*
Pro-Boers, Position of
O. Mr. J. Chamberlain, *July 25*, 1195.
Racial Hatred and Suspicion between the two Races in Natal and Cape Colony
Os. Sir R. Reid, *July 25*, 1182; Mr. J. Chamberlain, 1189, 1196.
Rebels
Martial Law, *see* that sub-heading.
Papers Relating to—Laying on the Table
Q. Mr. S. Buxton; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *July 19*, 461.
Punishment
Debate in Com. of Supply, *July 25*, 1164.
Blame Attached to the Government, 1166.
Canadian Rebellion Analogy, 1169, 1223.
Chamberlain's, Mr., Defence, 1191.
Colonial Secretary and the Cape Government, 1165, 1171, 1191.
Commissioners to be Appointed to try Rebels, 1170, 1192, 1221.
Confiscation and Damage to Property, 1167.
Disfranchisement, Balance of Political Power—Suspension of Cape Constitution, etc., 1167, 1184, 1191, 1201, 1221, 1237, 1239, 1245, 1252.
Distinction between Ringleaders, "willing" Rebels, etc., 1165, 1221.
James of Hereford, Lord, on, 1169, 1184, 1247, 1252.
Loyal and Disloyal Dutch, 1189.
"Prevention," not "Revenge," 1194.
Roberts's, Lord, Proclamation of Warning to the Orange River Colony, 1178.
Relief Funds—Patriotic Fund Commissioners' Administration, *see* title Patriotic Fund Commissioners.
Rolling Stock—Expenditure on, etc.
Wyndham's, Mr., Statement, *July 27*, 1531.
O. Sir C. Dilke, *July 27*, 1541.
Royal Irish Rifles, Command—Appointment
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 27*, 1503.
Sanitary Arrangements at the Cape, etc.
Correspondence between Sir W. Foster and the War Office Presented, *July 16*, 57.

South African War—*cont.*

Sanitary Arrangements, etc.—*cont.*

Inadequate Arrangements
O. Sir W. Foster, *July 27*, 1567.

Inquiry proposed
Q. Sir W. Foster; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 27*, 1499.

Settlement of Soldiers, *see* sub-heading Soldier Settlers.

Settlement after the War—Annexation, Form of Government, etc.
Os. Mr. S. Buxton, *July 25*, 1171; Mr. A. Elliot, 1178; Sir R. Reid, 1179; Mr. E. Cecil, 1212; Mr. Labouchere, 1226; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 1230; Mr. Courtney, 1248; Sir E. Grey, 1253.

Balfour's, Mr., Statement, 1242.

Chamberlain's, Mr. J., Statement, 1196.

Disarmament, Number of Troops necessary to Uphold the Authority of the Queen, etc.
Os. Sir R. Reid, 1183; Mr. E. Cecil, 1215.

Military Administration
Os. Mr. J. Chamberlain, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 1198.

Permanent Garrison - Number of Men, etc., Wyndham's, Mr., Statement, *July 27*, 1560.
O. Capt. Sinclair, *July 27*, 1591.

Rose-Innes', Mr., Opinion
Os. Mr. J. Chamberlain, *July 25*, 1197; Mr. Labouchere, 1222.

Wyndham's, Mr., Statement, *July 27*, 1530.

Shirt Contracts—Number of Shirts supplied, etc.
Q. Mr. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. J. P. Williams, *July 23*, 861.

Soldier Settlers after the War
Os. Mr. E. Cecil, *July 25*, 1216; Capt. Sinclair, *July 27*, 1591.

Inter-Departmental Committee
Q. Lord Wolverton; *A.* Earl of Selborne, *July 23*, 843.

Stores—Naval Stores, *see* that sub-heading

Sufferings caused by the War
O. Mr. J. Chamberlain, *July 25*, 1189.

Surgeons, *see* sub-heading Hospital and Medical Arrangements.

Surrender of British Troops, Guns, etc—Inquiry
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *July 27*, 1541; Sir J. Colomb, 1552; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 1557; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 1558; Mr. E. Robertson, 1611.

Lindley Disaster
Q. Mr. Kimber; *A.* M. Wyndham, *July 27*, 1501.

Trial by Court-Martial
O. Col. Welby, *July 27*, 1602.

South African War—*cont.*

Telegrams—Censorship, *see* that sub-heading.

Transport—Deficient Regimental Transport, Half Rations, etc.
O. Mr. Warner, *July 27*, 1586.

Transport Service, *see* that title.

Tugela Engagement—Colonel Long's Explanation, Publication of
Q. Gen. Russell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 19*, 459; *Q.* Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July*, *20*, 645.

Typhoid Fever, *see* sub-heading Enteric.

Volunteers, *see* that title.

Walsh, Private—Under-age Recruit, Discharge, Pension, etc.
Q. Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 19*, 458.

Warren's Sir C., Appointment
O. Sir C. Dilke, *July 27*, 1545.

White, Sir. G., Return from South Africa —"Jingo Ovations," etc.
O. Mr. E. Robertson, *July 27*, 1613.

Widows of Men who have died in the War —Provision for
O. Mr. Wyndham, *July 27*, 1624.

Women sent over to Enemy's Lines, *see* sub-heading Boer Women.

Yeomanry, Imperial, *see* Yeomanry.

South Denes Volunteer Camp

Brownrigg, Col., Prohibiting Visits and Collections by Sisters of Nazareth
Qs. Dr. Tanner; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 19*, 458; *July 20*, 648; *July 24*, 1047.

South Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railways Bill

c. 2R.* *July 16*, 53.
Reported with Amendts., *July 24*, 1039.

South Eastern Metropolitan Tramways Bill

l. 3R.* *July 19*, 410.
c. Lords Amendts.* *July 25*, 1161.

South Kensington Museum

Victoria and Albert Museum, *see* that title.

South Metropolitan Gas Bill

l. Report from Select Committee, *July 16*, 2.
3R.* *July 23*, 786.
c. Lords Amendts.* *July 27*, 1495.

South Shields Corporation Bill

c. Reported with Amendts., *July 17*, 216.
*Con.** *July 24*, 1038.
3R.* *July 27*, 1496.
l. Commons Amendts.* *July 27*, 1456.

South Staffordshire Tramways Bill
l. Commons Amendts.* *July 16*, 3 ; *July 19*, 411.

South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Bill
c. Con. and 3R.* *July 16*, 41.
l. 1R.* *July 17*, 190.
2R.* *July 23*, 786.
Committed, *July 24*, 985.
Report from Committee of Selection, *July 24*, 987 ; *July 26*, 1267.
Report from Select Committee, *July 27*, 1449.
Standing Orders, *July 20*, 585.

Southport Corporation Bill
l. 2R.* *July 19*, 410.
Reported with Amendts., *July 26*, 1266.
Standing Orders, *July 16*, 1.

Southwark
Housing of the Working Classes—Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill, *July 16*, 49, 51.
London (Southwark) Provisional Order Bill, *see* that title.

Souttar, Mr. R. [Dumfriesshire]
Indian Budget—Famine, Imperial Aid, etc., *July 26*, 1372.

Speaker (Rt. Hon. W. C. Gully) [Carlisle]
Adjournment of Debate—House having agreed to the Suspension of the Twelve o'clock Rule, Motion to adjourn Debate at 12.15, *July 24*, 1151, 1153, 1154.
Amendments to Bills out of Order
Companies Bill—Amendment with reference to Chartered Companies, *July 24*, 1065.
Education Bill—Amendments Raising Discussions on Subjects of Education, *July 19*, 527, 528, 529.
Charge on the Imperial Exchequer, Bills containing such Clauses—Preliminary Resolution unnecessary, as Expenses would be included in the Estimates, *July 25*, 1163.
Irrelevant Observations, *July 16*, 125, 130, 177.
Irish Language and the Intermediate Education Bill, *July 19*, 506, 507, 519.
Motions for Adjournment of the House to Discuss Matters of Urgent Public Importance
Anticipating Opportunity for Discussion in Committee of Supply, *July 16*, 93, 94.
Discussing same matter twice, *July 17*, 222, 223, 224.
Grievance not of Urgent Public Importance, *July 16*, 93, 94.
Questions—Making Speeches on putting Questions, *July 24*, 1043.

Spencer, Earl
Dock Accommodation for Naval Ships—New Works, etc., *July 17*, 208.
Education Bill, 2R., *July 23*, 799, 809.
Irish Railway Amalgamation Bills, 3R., *July 27*, 1451, 1453, 1455.
Poor Removal Bill, 3R., *July 19*, 418.
Reorganisation of the Army and Reconstruction of the War Office, *July 17*, 202.
Tithe Rent-charge (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *July 19*, 421.

Spirit Imports
Niger Coast Protectorate—Amount imported in 1898 and 1899, Duties paid on Stocks by Native Traders, etc.
Q. Mr. Lawrence ; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *July 23*, 867.

Stamps
Excess Charge on unstamped Letters—Number of Charges, Stamps found loose in Post Offices, etc.
Q. Mr. Duckworth ; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 23*, 871.

Standing Committees
see Committees.

Standing Orders
Resolutions Reported from Committee, *July 16*, 54 ; *July 23*, 785.
Sittings and Adjournments of the House—Suspension of Standing Orders Motion (Mr. A. J. Balfour), *July 16*, 95.
(*see also* titles of Bills.)

Stanhope, Mr. P. J. [Burnley]
Burnley Miners—Mines Regulation Acts, Enforcing Check-weighing Clauses, etc., *July 26*, 1317.
Indian Army—British Officers in Native Regiments, Increase in Number of—Cost, etc., *July 26*, 1314.

Steadman, Mr. W. C. [Tower Hamlets, Stepney]
Customs Watchers—Improved Conditions of Service, *July 26*, 1330.
Post Office Employees
Central Telegraph Office — Punishment for Exceeding Dinner Interval, etc., *July 20*, 656.
Delays—Charges against Postmen and Sorters, *July 24*, 1058.
Holidays—Postmen signing Holiday Sheet, *July 26*, 1327.
Liverpool Postal Staff—Promotion of Clerk to be Superintendent, etc., *July 20*, 655.

Steadman, Mr. W. C.—*cont.*
Post Office Employees—*cont.*
Mount Pleasant—Postmen's Overtime Pay, *July 24*, 1058.
Straw Hats for Postmen, *July 26*, 1326.
York—Assistant Inspector of Postmen keeping Shop with Beer Off Licence, *July 20*, 655.

Stephens, Mr. H. C. [Middlesex, Hornsey]
Season Tickets—Issue to Third Class Passengers, *July 23*, 873.

Stewart, Sir Donald
Death of
Os. Lord Hamilton, *July 26*, 1364; Sir H. Fowler, 1367.

Stewart, Sir M. J. M. [Kirkcudbright]
"Kowshing" Claims—Arbitration, *July 26*, 1315.
Postal Deliveries, Scotland—Delay in Delivery of Newspapers in South Western District, *July 20*, 659.

Strachey, Mr. E. [Somerset, S.]
Post Office Sites (Re-committed) Bill, *Com.*, *July 18*, 397.

Strafford, Earl of
Sat First in Parliament after the death of his Brother, *July 20*, 585.

Strathcona and Mount Royal, Lord
War Medals—Distributing immediately after the War, *July 26*, 1290.

Straw Hats for Postmen
see Postmen.

Strutt, Hon. C. H. [Essex, Maldon]
Agricultural Holdings Bill, 3R., *July 19*, 543.

Submarine Boats
Experiments — Watching Experiments Abroad, etc.
Os. Mr. Harwood, *July 17*, 303; Capt. Phillpotts, 313; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 321; Mr. Goschen, 333.
Trials of, during French Naval Manœuvres
Q. Mr. Harwood; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *July 26*, 1310.

Suburban Railway Fares
see Railways—Fares.

Sullivan, Mr. T. D. [Donegal, W.]
Brehon Laws, Publication of, *July 26*, 1337.

Sullivan, Mr. T. D.—*cont.*
Dungloe Sessions, Truck Act Prosecution—Case of Mr. O'Donnell, *July 23*, 882.
Irish Language
Census Returns, *July 20*, 660.
Use of in Irish Schools in place of English, *July 20*, 733.
Sorters' Examinations, *July 26*, 1327.

Sunday Closing (Monmouthshire) Bill
Petitions, *July 18*, 342; *July 20*, 639; *July 23*, 847; *July 24*, 1039.

Sunday Opening of Museums, etc.
Public Institutions—Sale of Catalogues
Q. Mr. Massey-Mainwaring; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 16*, 86.

Sunderland Corporation Bill
l. Reported without Amendts., *July 16*, 2.
3R.* *July 19*, 410.
c. 1R.* *July 19*, 452.
Standing Orders, *July 23*, 844.

Superannuation
Civil Servants, *see* that title.
Devizes Prison, *see* that title.
Teachers in Isle of Man and Channel Islands
Q. Mr. Yoxall; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *July 16*, 71.
(*see also* titles of Bills.)

Supply
Army and Navy Estimates, *see* those titles.
Business of the House—Additional Days Motion (Mr. A. J. Balfour), *July 16*, 95.
Business of the House—New Estimates
O. Mr. G. Bowles, *July 16*, 102.
Civil Service Estimates
Additional Supplementary Estimate Presented, *July 17*, 217.
Colonial Office—£32,250, *Com.*, *July 25*, 1164.
Irish Votes
Education—£787,503, *Com.*, *July 20*, 673.
Reformatory and Industrial Schools—£54,767, *Com.*, *July 20*, 771.

Surveyors
see Ireland.

Sutton to Censure Railway
Method of Construction, etc.
Q. Mr. T. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *July 26*, 1339.

Sutton-Howth Tramway
Laying Tramway by the side of the Road instead of on the Road—Application for Parliamentary Powers, etc.
Q. Mr. T. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 19*, 477; *Q.* Mr. T. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *July 23*, 881.

Sweden
Trade Report Presented, *July 27*, 1458.

Ta-ku
see China—Anti-Foreign Rising.

Talbot, Rt. Hon. J. G. [Oxford University]
Rockhall and Rochford House—Religious Instruction for Children, Non-appointment of Church of England Chaplain, etc., *July 17*, 232.

Tanner, Dr. C. K. D. [Cork Co., Mid]
Army
Civil Surgeons—Supposed Pledge of Secrecy, *July 27*, 1502.
Retired Medical Officers Recalled to Active Service, *July 27*, 1503.
Irish Language, Use of, in Irish Schools, in Place of English, *July 20*, 761.
Oil in Tobacco Bill, *Com.*, *July 19*, 584.
Postmen
Straw Hats for, *July 26*, 1326.
Uniforms — Relative Weight of Summer and Winter Uniforms, *July 27*, 1518.
Public Works Loans Bill, *Com.*, *July 23*, 979, 983.
South African War
Boer Women, Expulsion of, from Pretoria, *July 24*, 1044; *July 26*, 1303.
Nurses, Number of Deaths in Orange River Colony, etc., *July 24*, 1044.
South Denes Volunteer Camp—Col. Brownrigg prohibiting Visits and Collections by Sisters of Nazareth, *July 19*, 458; *July 20*, 648, 649; *July 24*, 1047.
Woolwich Arsenal — James Quinlan's Claim for Compensation, *July 26*, 1309.

Tarbert
Railway from Listowel—Receiving Deputation with a View to giving Grant
Q. Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 19*, 478.

Taunton Corporation Bill
l. Report of Attorney-General, *July 19*, 409.
2R.* *July 19*, 410.
Reported with Amendts., *July 26*, 1266.

Taxation
India, *see* that title.
Local Taxation, *see* that title.

Taxes and Imposts
Return Presented, *July 19*, 452.

Taylor, William
Newbliss Postman—Attending Orange Demonstration at Clones
Q. Mr. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 24*, 1063.

Teachers
see Education.
National School Teachers, Ireland, *see* that title.

Teachers of Music Registration Bill
c. 1R.* *July 20*, 673.

Teachers' Superannuation Act
Channel Islands and Isle of Man, Extending to—Legislation
Q. Mr. Yoxall; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *July 16*, 71.
(*see also* titles of Bills.)

Technical Instruction
Committees—Women Members, Return Presented, *July 20*, 639.
Minute of Board of Education Sanctioning Subjects to be taught under Clause 8, Presented, *July 16*, 8, 56; *July 20* 588, 639.

Telegraph Service
Cable Communication, *see* that title.
Revenue and Expenditure — Return Ordered, *July 23*, 849.

Telegraph Service Employes
Central Office, Overtime, etc.
Q. Mr. Woods; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 19*, 472.
Harwich Post Office Staff—Transferring Female Telegraphist to Enfield, Removal Expenses, etc.
Q. Mr. Goddard; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 20*, 657.
Limerick Telegraph Messengers
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 26*, 1332.
Liverpool—Promotion of No. 34 on the Seniority List
Q. Mr. M'Ghee; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 17*, 233.

Tenancy Contracts
Ireland—District Council's Disqualification
Q. Sir W. Foster; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 26*, 1337.

ennant, Mr. H. J. [Berwickshire]
Arsenic, Reduction of Employment—Report of Inquiry, Laying on the Table, *July 26*, 1318, 1319.
Great Eastern Railway Labour Dispute, *July 26*, 1322.
Sheffield Laundry Prosecution—Contract with War Office, *July 23*, 875.

Tents
Army—Supply of Tents, etc.
Os. Lord Heneage, Marquess of Lansdowne, *July 17*, 205, 206.

Thomas, Mr. A. [Glamorganshire, E.]
Agricultural Holdings Bill, 3R., *July 19*, 544.

Thomas, Mr. D. A. [Merthyr Tydvil]
Coal
Exportation of, to Foreign Countries, from England and the United States, Statistics, *July 20*, 654.
Naval Emergency Contracts, *July 17*, 227; *July 20*, 650.
Madagascar—Infraction of British Trade Rights by France, Reply to Representations, *July 19*, 463.
Private Bill Legislation, Cost of—Delay in presenting Return, *July 17*, 235.

Tientsin
see China—Anti-Foreign Rising.

"Times"
Fire Brigades Committee Report, Publication of, previous to Laying on Table
Q. Sir G. Fardell; *A.* Mr. J. Collings, *July 20*, 654.

"Times of Natal"
Letters addressed to — Publication in South African Blue-book
Q. Capt. Donelan; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *July 20*, 645.

Tipperary
Constabulary — Medical Appointment, Neglecting to Consult Wishes of the Police
Q. Mr. T. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 19*, 474.

Tithe Rent-charge (Ireland) Bill
c. Re-com. and 3R., *July 16*, 117.
l. 1R * *July 17*, 193.
2R., *July 19*, 420.
Com., *July 23*, 840.
Reported without Amendts., *July 24*, 988.
Reported with Amendts., *July 26*, 1275.
3R.* *July 27*, 1495.

Tithe Rent-charge (Ireland) Bill
Debate on Third Reading (Commons), *July 16*, 117; Second Reading (Lords), *July 19*, 420; Committee (Lords), *July 23*, 840; Report (Lords), *July 26*, 1275.
Annuities
Miscalculation by the Treasury, alleged, 153, 168, 422, 429.
Rate of Interest, Reduction in Period for Redemption, etc., 141, 142, 152, 169, 422, 425, 428.
Ardilaun, Lord—Dublin *Daily Express*, etc., 137, 142.
Basis of Variation—Judicial Rent *v.* Price of Produce, 160, 165, 425.
Church Fund, Effect of the Bill on, 135, 151, 168, 176, 178, 425, 434.
Compulsory Redemption, Period for Redemption, Treasury Consent, etc., 142, 179, 1279, 1281, 1282.
Corn Averages, Publication in the *Dublin Gazette*—Decision of Appeal Court, etc., 421, 422, 429.
Ecclesiastical Tithes — Variability, etc., 151.
Ecclesiastical and Lay Tithes, Drawing Distinction between, 166.
"Equivalent Estates" Application of the Bill to, 140.
Estates purchased since 1896, 135, 137, 139, 141, 142.
Estates sold between 1872 and 1896, Application of the Bill to, 135, 431, 1276, 1277.
Irish Church Glebe Purchasers, 160, 163.
Land Commission, Powers of, 142, 840, 1283.
Land Speculators, 137.
Landlords' Grievances, 424, 426, 427, 430, 431, 432.
Lay Tithes — Variability, Revision, etc., 151, 165, 421, 422, 429, 433, 1275.
Mortgages, Marriage Settlements, etc., Exclusion from the Bill, 135, 136.
Omission of Report Stage, 118, 119, 120, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 130, 132.
Poor Rate—Deduction from Tithe Rent-charge, 425.
Produce—Wheat and Oats, Fall in Prices since 1872, 424, 433.
Purchase since May 12, 1899, Application of the Bill to, 145, 146, 1276.
Rents
Judicial Rent, 157.
Reasons for Reductions, Fall in Price of Produce, Tenants' Improvements, etc., 159.
Ulster, 160, 164, 182.

Tithe Rent-charge (Ireland) Bill—*cont.*
Debate, etc.—*cont.*
Sales under the Land Acts, Value of Property, etc., 138, 139, 142, 428.
Section 40 of Act of 1896, 137, 138.
Settlement of 1869-72, 152, 422, 423, 428, 1276, 1279, 1283.
Treasury—Restoring to the Treasury Power of Deciding Period of Purchase, 840, 1283.
Treasury Memorandum of 1895, 141.

Tobacco
Oil in Tobacco Bill, *see* that title.

Tomlinson, Mr. W. E. M. [Preston]
Cable Communication in the West Indies —Want of Direct Communication, Dependence on Foreign Cables, etc., *July 19*, 464.
Companies Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1073, 1107, 1134.
Volunteers Bill, *Com.*, *July 23*, 955.

Tonga Islands
British Protectorate, Proclamation of
Q. Mr. Hogan; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *July 24*, 1050.

Torpedo Boats
Construction of, by British Firms for China—Legislation
Q. Col. Pilkington; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 23*, 853.
(*see also* Navy.)

Tossel, Lieut.
Attempt to blow up Pretoria Magazine—Sentence of Death
Qs. Mr. P. O'Brien; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 17*, 224; *July 24*, 1043.

Tottenham Urban District Council Bill
l. 2R.* *July 16*, 2.
Report from Select Committee, *July 19*, 413; *July 26*, 1265.
Report from Committee of Selection, *July 23*, 788.

Town Councils (Scotland) Bill
l. Com., *July 20*, 589.
Reported with Amendts., *July 24*, 988; *July 26*, 1275.

Traction Engines
Use of, on Public Roads, Expenditure on Coast Road between Glenarm and Larne—Legislation proposed, etc.
Q. Mr. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 19*, 476.

Trade, Board of
President—Rt. Hon. C. T. Ritchie.

Trade Marks
"Foreign Origin"—Imported Tin Boxes, etc.
Q. Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 27*, 1518.

Trade Reports Presented
Annual Series, *July 17*, 192; *July 18*, 343; *July 20*, 588, 640; *July 24*, 988, 1040; *July 25*, 1162; *July 26*, 1268; *July 27*, 1458, 1498.
Miscellaneous Series, *July 17*, 192; *July 18*, 343.

Trade and Commerce
Canadian Exports to Germany
Q. Gen. Laurie; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 26*, 1343.
Honduras — Treaty of Commerce and Navigation with, *July 19*, 413.
India
"India England's Fourth best Customer"
O. Mr. Souttar, *July 26*, 1315.
Statistics
Q. Sir M. Bhownaggree; *A.* Lord G. Hamilton, *July 26*, 1315.
Madagascar, British Trade in, *see* Madagascar.
Uruguay—Treaty of Commerce and Navigation with, Presented, *July 24*, 988, 1040.

Training Squadron
see Navy.

Tramways
Bills relating to Tramways, *see* their titles.
Sutton-Howth Tramway, *see* that title.

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill
c. Reported with Amendts., *July 20*, 637.
*Con.** *July 23*, 846.
3R.* *July 24*, 1038.
l. Commons Amendts.* *July 26*, 1267.

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill
c. 2R.* *July 17*, 215.
Reported without Amendt., *July 27*, 1496.
Standing Orders, *July 16*, 52.

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 3) Bill
c. 2R.* *July 24*, 1038.
Memorandum Ordered, *July 17*, 217—Presented, *July 18*, 343.
Standing Orders, *July 23*, 844; *July 26*, 1296.

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 4) Bill
c. 2R.* *July 24*, 1038.
Standing Orders, *July 23*, 844; *July 26*, 1296.

Tramways Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill
l. 2R.* *July 16*, 4.
*Com.** *July 27*, 1457.
Report from Committee of Selection, *July 19*, 413; *July 23*, 788.
Report from Select Committee, *July 26*, 1265.

Transport
Regimental Transport, *see* South African War.

Transport Service
Return—Delay in issue
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Macartney, *July 16*, 62.
South African War
"Avondale Castle"—Non-observance of Queen's Regulations fixing Canteen Prices
Q. Mr. Bryce; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 19*, 457.
"Custodian" — Complaints against Provisions and Canteen Arrangements
Q. Mr. Paulton; *A.* Mr. Macartney, *July 19*, 457.
Transport Officers—Rewards and Distinctions
Q. Mr. Lambert; *A.* Mr. Goschen, *July 23*, 857.

Travers' Foundation
Income and Expenditure Statement—Approval
Resolution (Mr. A. Chamberlain), *July 19*, 584.

Trawling
Irish Waters—Protection of Fisheries, Naval Gunboats proposed
Q. Mr. Power; *A.* Mr. Plunkett, *July 23*, 885.

Trevelyan, Mr. C. P. [York, W.R., Elland]
Great Eastern Railway—Labour Dispute, Arbitration, etc., *July 26*, 1322.
Luggage
Excess Charges—Laying Correspondence on the Table, *July 20*, 653.
Free Luggage Allowances, *July 16*, 75.

Truck Act
Prosecution of Mr. O'Donnell at Dungloe Petty Sessions
Q. Mr. T. D. Sullivan; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *July 23*, 882.

Trust Investments
Colonial Stock Bill, *see* that title.

Tuberculosis
Case of on West Cheshire Farm—Action of Medical Officers of Health
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Chaplin, *July 24*, 1054.

Tugela Engagement
see South African War.

Tuke, Sir J. B. [Edinburgh and St. Andrews Universities]
Companies Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1068.

Tully, Mr. J. [Leitrim, S.]
South African War—Expenditure, etc., *July 27*, 1638.

Turbine Principle
Torpedo Boats, etc.—Mr. Goschen's Statement, *July 17*, 243.

Turkey
Trade Report Presented, *July 17*, 192.

Tweedmouth, Lord
Army—Question of Remounts, Lessons of the South African War, *July 17*, 204.
County and Borough Franchise Assimilation (London) Bill, 2R., *July 17*, 194.
Reading Clerkship of the House of Lords, Appointment—Power of Appointing Reverting to the Clerk of Parliament, Appointment of Legal Assistant, etc., *July 24*, 1011, 1023.

Twelve o'Clock Rule
Suspension of
Motion (Mr. A. J. Balfour), *July 16*, 95.

Tyne River Police Force
Refusal of Home Secretary's Certificate—Correspondence Presented, *July 24*, 988, 1040.

Tyrone
Postal Arrangements—Coagh
Q. Mr. Doogan; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 26*, 1333.

Uganda
British Protectorate
Report of Special Commissioner Presented, *July 26*, 1268, 1298.

Ulster Custom
Dublin Land Commission Court—Case of Lindsay *v.* Corry, Judge's Decision
Q. Mr. S. Young; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 17*, 237.

Under-age Recruits
see Army—Enlistment and Recruiting.

United States
Coal — Exportation of, to Foreign Countries, Statistics
Q. Mr. D. A. Thomas ; *A.* Mr. Ritchie, *July 20*, 654.
Trade Report Presented, *July 17*, 192.

Universities, Scotland
Fees—Return
Q. Mr. T. Shaw ; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *July 20*, 659.
Return Ordered, *July 23*, 849.
General Report of Commissioners Presented, *July 23*, 795, 848.

Urban Schools
Educational Grants—Differential Treatment in Rural and Urban Schools Motion (Lord Heneage), *July 24*, 1024.

Uruguay
Treaty of Friendship, Commerce, and Navigation Presented, *July 24*, 988, 1040.

Vaccination
Bacterial Impurity of Vaccine Lymph supplied by Local Government Board, alleged
Q. Mr. T. Bayley ; *A.* Mr. Chaplin, *July 26*, 1315.
Prosecutions—Case of F. J. Chatting
Q. Mr. L. Sinclair ; *A.* Sir M. W. Ridley, *July 16*, 72.

Vacher, Dr.
Medical Officer of Health—Case of Tuberculosis on West Cheshire Farm
Q. Mr. Field ; *A.* Mr. Chaplin, *July 24*, 1054.

Valentia Harbour
Perch or Buoy, Erection of, proposed—Lighthouse Authority, etc.
Q. Capt. Donelan ; *A.* Mr. Plunkett, *July 23*, 886.

Ventilation of Committee Rooms
see Committee Rooms.

Veterinary Surgeons Amendment Bill
*l. Com.** and *Rep.* July 16*, 40.
Reported without Amendts., *July 17*, 193.
3R.* *July 19*, 420.

Victoria and Albert Museum
Assistantship, Examination for—Selecting Candidates by Nomination
Q. Mr. W. F. D. Smith ; *A.* Sir J. Gorst, *July 17*, 235.

"Victoria and Albert" Yacht
Removal of Silicate Cotton, etc.
Qs. Sir E. Gourley ; Mr. G. Bowles ; *As.* Mr. Goschen, *July 27*, 1509.

Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H. [Sheffield, Central]
Aldershot
Entrenchments, *July 27*, 1574.
Taking over Command, Expenses, etc., *July 27*, 1577.
Coal—National Coal Reserve, Rise in Price, etc., *July 27*, 1511.
Indian Budget—Famine, Imperial Grant, etc., *July 26*, 1421.
Military Lands Bill, 2R., *July 23*, 914, 915.
Musketry Training—Lessons of the South African War, *July 27*, 1573.
Scouting, Training in, *July 27*, 1574.
South African War
Censorship of Letters and Telegrams, *July 27*, 1575.
Inquiry into Conduct of the War, *July 27*, 1572.
Trade Marks — "Foreign Origin," Imported Tin Boxes, etc., *July 27*, 1518.
Volunteers, Employment on Foreign Service, *July 27*, 1505.
Volunteers Bill, *Com.*, *July 23*, 929, 931, 932, 933, 934, 939, 948.

"Vindictive," H.M.S.
Manœuvres of 1899, Speed, etc.—Adm. Domvile's Report and the Statement in the Memorandum
Q. Mr. G. Bowles ; *A.* Mr. Goschen *July 17*, 227.

Voluntary School Rate
Didsbury—Applying for Rate on same Demand Note as Poor and General District Rate, etc.
Q. Mr. C. Williams ; *A.* Mr. Chaplin, *July 26*, 1317.

Voluntary Schools
Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill, *see* that title.
Grants
Differential Treatment and Rural and Urban Schools
Motion (Lord Heneage), *July 24*, 1024.
Imperial Grant—Total Amount for 1899
Q. Mr. Caldwell ; *A.* Sir J. Gorst, *July 20*, 658.

Volunteers
Camps
Number of Men who have been in Camp fourteen Days—"Magnificent Response"
Wyndham's, Mr., Statement *July 27*, 1532.
South Denes Camp, *see* that title.

[*cont.*

Volunteers—*cont.*

Emergency Scheme, Expenditure on, etc.
Wyndham's, Mr., Statement, *July 27*, 1531.

Employment on Foreign Service
Q. Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 27*, 1505.
(*see also* Volunteers Bill.)

Engineer Corps for South-east Lancashire, Formation of, proposed
Q. Sir J. W. Maclure; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 20*, 649; *July 26*, 1305.

Garrison Duty—Offers of Service, etc.
Q. Mr. Seely; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 24*, 1046.

Inniskilling Fusiliers, *see* that title.

Irish Regiments, Formation of, proposed —Grievance
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 20*, 665.

Kent Artillery, 2nd—Easter Camp Allowance
Q. Sir F. Evans; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 20*, 648.

Leicesters, 1st Battalion—Insufficient Supply of Rifles
Q. Major Rasch; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 24*, 1048.

Rifle Clubs and Rifle Ranges, *see* those titles.

South African War
Gratuities to Officers
Q. Mr. J. A. Pease; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 27*, 1505.
Volunteers Invalided Home, Treatment of, by the War Office.
O. Mr. Seely, *July 27*, 1599.

South Denes Camp, *see* that title.

Travelling Expenses — Supplementary Grant, etc.
Q. Lord Balcarres; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 22*, 860.

Volunteers Bill

c. 2R., *July 18*, 344.
Com., *July 23*, 925.

Volunteers Bill

Debate on Second Reading and in Committee, etc., *July 18*, 344; *July 23*, 925.
Civil Employment of Volunteers, Effect of the Bill on, 356, 363, 367, 938, 944.
Classes of Volunteers—Creating three Classes, Objections to, 364, 369, 375, 380, 384.
Conditions under which Volunteers are called out, Recruiting, etc., 344, 361, 371, 374, 380, 926, 929, 930, 931, 933, 934, 935, 937, 941, 944, 946, 950.
Conference of Sixteen Representative Officers of Volunteer Corps, 346, 349, 353, 361, 363, 368, 376, 377.
"Discussion held by a Body of Volunteer Officers" Pamphlet, 931.
Filling Vacancies of Units Liable for Active Service, 355, 373.

Volunteers Bill—*cont.*

Debate on Second Reading, etc.—*cont.*
Liability for Active Service, Home and Foreign Service—Effect on Recruiting, etc., 349, 351, 357, 363, 369, 372, 381, 382, 385, 946, 960.
Militia, Application of the Foreign Service Clause to, 379, 380.
Period of Liability for Service, 374.
Postponing the Bill for fuller and wider Consideration
O. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 16*, 96.
Volunteer Acts of 1894—Report of Select Committee, 344, 347, 361, 367, 927, 930, 932.
Volunteer Garrison Artillery, Calling Out, etc., 347, 369, 372, 374, 378, 379, 932, 950, 953, 954, 957, 958, 959.

Wages

Armstrong, Whitworth, and Co.'s., Messrs., Manchester Works—Joiners' Wages, alleged Breach of Fair Wages Resolution, etc.
Q. Mr. Woods; *A.* Mr. J. P. Williams, *July 26*, 1308.

Local Authorities Contracts—Return Presented, *July 24*, 1040.

Workmen's Compensation Act Extension Bill, Effect of, on Wages.
Os. Earl of Wemyss, Visc. Cross, *July 16*, 38, 39.

Wales—War Office Employee

Discharge of—Bonus, etc.
Q. Captain Norton; *A.* Mr. J. P. Williams, *July 23*, 859.

Wallace, Mr. R. [Perth]

Companies Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1079.

Sheriff Court Procedure—Report of Committee, *July 26*, 1330.

Walsall Corporation Bill

c. Reported with Amendts., *July 18*, 341.
*Con.** and 3R.* *July 27*, 1496.
l. Commons Amendts.* *July 27*, 1456.

Walsh, Private

Under-age Recruit—Discharge, Pension, etc.
Q. Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 19*, 458.

Walton, Mr. J. [York, W.R., Barnsley]

China—Anti-Foreign Rising
British Forces
Inadequate Provision for upholding British Rights and Interests, *July 27*, 1599.
Naval and Military Reinforcements, *July 20*, 640.
Foreigners, Assisting to Escape, *July 19*, 453.

Walton, Mr. J.—*cont.*
China—Anti-Foreign Rising—*cont.*
Gunboats for Protection of British Traders on Inland Waterways, *July 17*, 334; *July 20*, 642.
Indian Famine—Imperial Grant, Irrigation and Railway Works, etc., *July 26*, 1394.
Water-tube Boilers—Committee of Inquiry, etc., *July 17*, 334.

Walton, Mr. J. L. [Leeds, S.]
Companies Bill, *Con.*, *July* 24, 1067, 1094, 1096, 1101, 1124, 1127, 1136, 1145, 1160.
Business of the House, *July 16*, 103.

Wandsworth
Board of Guardians—Offer of Free Pardon to Parents Reclaiming Deserted Children, Issue of Notice, etc.
Q. Mr. Flower; *A.* Mr. Chaplin, *July 24*, 1054.

Wandsworth and Putney Gas Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *July 20*, 586.
3R.* *July 27*, 1450.

War Expenditure
see South African War—Finance and Cost of the War.

War Funds
Patriotic Fund Commissioners, *see* that title.

War Medals
see South African War—Medals.

War Office
Secretary of State—Marquess of Lansdowne.
Under Secretary—Mr. G. Wyndham.
Financial Secretary—Mr J. P. Williams.
Administration—Attack on Lord Lansdowne
Arnold-Forster, Mr., *July 27*, 1516; Mr. S. MacNeill, 1631.
O. Mr. Wyndham, *July 27*, 1616.
Contracts, *see* Army.
Employees' Bonus—Case of Wales
Q. Capt. Norton; *A.* Mr. J. P. Williams, *July 23*, 859.
Expert Information—Statements in the House of Lords by the Commander-in-Chief, suggested, *see* title Commander-in-Chief.
Reconstruction—Government Proposals Debate (Lords), *July 17*, 196.
Reorganisation, etc.
O. Major Rasch, *July 27*, 1550.

Warble Fly
Precautions against Injury to Cattle—Issue of Leaflet, etc.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Plunkett, *July 20*, 670.

Ward, Private W.
Death of, at Yarmouth from Sunstroke, alleged
Q. Mr. Soames; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 26*, 1305.

Warden, Mr.
Police Protection at Sneem
Qs. Mr. Flavin, Mr. Flynn; *As.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 19*, 481.
Sneem Pier—Erection of Goods Store, Objections
Q. Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Plunkett, *July 20*, 669.

Warden Estate
National School Teacher's Residence Site
Q. Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 20*, 662.

Warders
see Prisons.

Warner, Mr. C. T. C. [Stafford, Lichfield]
Post Office Sites (Re-committed) Bill, *Com.*, *July 18*, 388, 395.
Reserve Forces Bill, 2R., *July 18*, 387.
South African War—Deficient Regimental Transport, Half Rations, etc., *July 27*, 1586.
Volunteers Bill, 2R., *July 18*, 380, 382.
War Office Organisation—Need for Military Reform, etc., *July 27*, 1585.

Warren, Mr.
Consul-General at Shanghai, *see* China—Anti-Foreign Rising.

Warships
Construction of, by British Firms for China—Legislation
Q. Col. Pilkington; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 23*, 853.
(*see also* Navy—Shipbuilding Programme, etc.)

Wason, Mr. E. [Clackmannan and Kinross]
South African War—Hardships, Troops half-starved, alleged, *July 27*, 1577.

Water Gas
Use of—Recommendations of Departmental Committee, etc.
Qs. Mr. J. W. Wilson, Mr. T. M. Healy; *As.* Mr. Ritchie, *July 20*, 653.

Water Orders Confirmation Bill
c. 3R.* *July 16*, 54.

Water Supply
Bills Relating to, *see* their titles.
Inver—Delay in Completing Works
Q. Mr. Caldwell; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *July 23*, 877.
Ireland—Clones
Q. Mr. Macaleese; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 26*, 1336.

Water-tube Boilers
Naval Ships, *see* Navy—Boilers.

Wedderburn, Sir W. [Banffshire]
India
Budget — Grant from the Imperial Government in aid of the Famine, etc., *July 26*, 1379.
Famine
Canadian Government Grant, proposed, *July 24*, 1052.
Land Revenue Remissions in Bombay and North-West Provinces, *July 19*, 465.
Loans to Native States, *July 19*, 464.
Relief Administration—State Aid and Private Benevolence, *July 24*, 1051.
Penal Legislation — Withdrawing recent Legislation proposed, *July 19*, 468.
Taxation—Amount yielded by new Taxation since 1886, Return, *July 19*, 469.

Wei-hai-wei
see China—Anti-Foreign Rising

Weir, Mr. J. G. [Ross and Cromarty]
Ashanti Rising—Coomassie Relief Column, Progress of, etc., *July 16*, 70.
Avoch Harbour Accommodation, Improvement of—Grant-in-aid, proposed, *July 16*, 78.
Lewis, Island of—Insanitary Condition, *July 16*, 77.
St. Petersburg Herring Trade—Facilities for discharge and storage, *July 16*, 71.
Transport Service—Delay in issue of Return, *July 16*, 62.

Weir, Private R.
Removal from Netley Hospital to Enniskillen Workhouse—Cause of Insanity, etc.
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 16*, 65.

Welby, Lieut.-Col. A. C. E. [Taunton]
Army Medical Department—Lessons of South African War, etc., *July 27*, 1602.
Companies Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1065.

Welby, Lieut.-Col. A. C. E.—*cont.*
South African War—Surrender of British Troops, Causes, Trial by Court-martial, etc., *July 27*, 1601.
Volunteers Bill, 2R., *July 18*, 384.
War Office Administration, Mr. Wyndham's Defence of, etc., *July 27*, 1604.

Welby, Lord
Indian Expenditure—Report of Royal Commission, *July 20*, 601.

Welby's, Lord, Commission
see India—Finance, Expenditure Commission, etc.

Wellingborough and District Tramroads Bill
c. Lords Amendts.* *July 18*, 341.

Wemyss, Earl of
Reconstruction of the War Office and Reorganisation of the Army—"Administration," not "Reorganisation" or "Reconstruction," *July 17*, 203.
Strength and Organisation of Home Defences, *July 27*, 1458.
Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension Bill, *Com.*, *July 16*, 37.

West Bromwich Corporation Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *July 23*, 785.

West Ham Corporation Bill
l. Report from Committee of Selection, *July 17*, 191.
Report from Select Committee, *July 23*, 785.
3R.* *July 27*, 1450.

West Indies
British Honduras—Want of Direct Cable Communication, Dependence on Foreign Cables, etc.
Q. Mr. Tomlinson; *A.* Mr. J. Chamberlain, *July 19*, 464.
Jamaica, *see* that title.

Westgate and Birchington Water Bill
c. 3R.* *July 16*, 53.

"Wet Bobs" of Naval Defence
Os. Earl of Wemyss, *July 27*, 1461; Earl of Rosebery, 1471.

Whisky in Bond
Scotland—Return Presented, *July 19*, 452.

White, Sir G.
Return from South Africa — "Jingo Ovations"
O. Mr. E. Robertson, *July 27*, 1613.

Whitechapel and Bow Railway Bill
c. Con. July 16*, 53.
3R.* *July 19*, 450.
l. Commons Amendts.* *July 20*, 586.

Whitmore, Mr. C. A. [Chelsea]
Dublin Corporation Bill, *Con.*, *July 26*, 1293.

Wild Animals
Cruelty to Wild Animals in Captivity Bill, *see* that title.

Willesden Board of Guardians
Rockhall and Rochford House, Religious Instruction for Children—Non-appointment of Church of England Chaplain, etc.
Q. Mr. Talbot; *A.* Mr. Chaplin, *July 17*, 232.

Williams, Mr. J. C. [Notts, Mansfield]
Didsbury Voluntary School Rate, Applying for on same Demand Note as Poor and General District Rate, etc., *July 26*, 1317.
Parliamentary Procedure — Proposed Changes, *July 19*, 484.
Tithe Rent-charge (Ireland) Bill, 3R., *July 16*, 123.

Williams, Mr. J. P.—*Financial Secretary to the War Office* [Birmingham, S.]
Armstrong, Whitworth, and Co., Messrs., Manchester Works — Joiners' Wages, alleged Breach of Fair Wages Resolution, etc., *July 26*, 1308.
Contracts
Irish Tenderers, Establishing Depôt in Dublin, proposed, *July 27*, 1508.
Shirt Contracts for South Africa—Total Number Supplied, Non-acceptance of Tenders from Irish Firms, etc., *July 23*, 861.
Kilworth Rifle Range — Acquisition of adjoining Land, *July 23*, 861.
Lance Exhibition—Sergeant Cartwright's Claim, *July 16*, 68.
Military Lands Bill, 2R, *July 23*, 913.
Wales, War Office Employee, Discharge of —Bonus, *July 23*, 859, 860.
Woolwich Arsenal — James Quinlan's Claim for Compensation, *July 26*, 1309.

Wilson, Mr. C. H. [Hull]
Water-tube Boilers on Naval and Merchant Ships, *July 17*, 294.

Wilson, Mr. J. [Falkirk Burghs]
China, Anti-Foreign Rising—Shansi, Reported Massacre of Missionaries, *July 20*, 642.
Volunteers Bill, *Com.*, *July 23*, 945.

Wilson, Mr. J. W. [Worcestershire, N.]
Water Gas, Use of—Recommendations of Departmental Committee, etc., *July 20*, 653, 654.

Wiltshire
New Member sworn for Southern or Wilton Division, *July 23*, 889.

Wimbledon
School Board, proposed — Ratepayers' Resolution, etc.
Q. Mr. Price; *A.* Sir J. Gorst, *July 24*, 1055.

Winchester, Bishop of
Ritualism in the Church—Disobedience of Clergy, etc., *July 16*, 35.

Windsor, Lord
Agricultural Holdings Bill, *Con.*, *July 27*, 1491.
Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) Amendment Bill, 2R., *July 20*, 633, 635.

Withington Urban District Council Bill
c. Reported with Amendts., *July 24*, 1039.

Wolverton, Lord
South Africa—Settlement of Soldiers in the Orange River Colony after the War, *July 23*, 843.

Women
Technical Instruction Committees—Women Members, Return Presented, *July 20*, 639.

Wood
Non-inflammable Wood, use of, in Construction of Naval Ships, *see* Navy—Shipbuilding.

Woods, Mr. S. [Essex, Walthamstow]
Armstrong, Whitworth, and Co., Messrs., Manchester Works—Joiners' Wages, alleged Breach of Fair Wages Resolution, etc., *July 26*, 1308.
Central Telegraph Office, Overtime at—Appointment of additional Telegraphists, etc., *July 19*, 472.

Woolwich Arsenal
Quinlan's, James, Claim for Compensation —Inquiry, proposed
Q. Dr. Tanner; *A.* Mr. J. P. Williams, *July 26*, 1309.

Workhouses, Ireland
Belfast—Postponement of Appointment of Master, etc.
Q. Mr. Daly; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 20*, 661.

Workhouses, Ireland—*cont.*
Carrickmacross—Number of Admissions
Q. Mr. Daly; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 26*, 1331.
Dietary Regulations — Giving greater freedom to Guardians, proposed
Q. Capt. Donelan; *A.* Mr. G. W. Balfour, *July 24*, 1059.
Poor Law Schools, *see* that title.

Workington Railways and Docks Bill
c. Report from Select Committee, *July 16*, 55.
2R.* *July 19*, 450.

Workmen's Compensation Act
Army and Navy Services—Number of Men Receiving Compensation, Amount of Compensation, etc. — Return Presented, *July 16*, 57.
Principles of, Extending to the Army, Allowances to Widows, etc.
O. Sir C. Dilke, *July 27*, 1540.
Proceedings—Statistics Presented, *July 26*, 1269, 1297.

Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension Bill
l. 3R., *July 16*, 37.
c. Lords Amendt.* *July 17*, 240.

Workmen's Compensation Act (1897) Extension Bill
Debate on Third Reading (Lords), *July 16*, 37.
Domestic Servants, 37, 39.
Insurance, 38.
Wages, Effect of the Bill on, 38, 39.

Workmen's Dwellings
see Housing of the Working Classes.

Wright, Mr. Justice
Bail Regulations—Statements at Derbyshire Assizes
Q. Mr. Hazell; *A.* Sir R. Finlay, *July 23*, 875.

Wylie, Mr. A. [Dumbartonshire]
Volunteers Bill, *Com.*, *July 23*, 938, 959.

Wyndham, Mr. G.—*Under Secretary of State for War* [Dover]
Aldershot Entertainments, Holding in Recreation Rooms instead of Canteens, proposed, *July 26*, 1306.
Ammunition—Small Arms Ammunition Supplies, *July 24*, 1046.
Arms and Ammunition, Exportation of, to China by British Firms—Legislation, proposed, *July 23*, 853.

Wyndham, Mr. G.—*cont.*
Artillery
Reserves of Artillery and Ammunition on the Outbreak of the South African War, *July 24*, 1045.
Second Lieutenants' Promotion Grievance, *July 17*, 225.
Camden Fort Gun Fatality, *July 20*, 647; *July 26*, 1304; *July 27*, 1507.
Chaplain, Appointment of, for Hong Kong, *July 19*, 462.
Chelsea Hospital Gardens—Hours of Closing, *July 16*, 67.
Commissions and Public Schools—Number allotted to Eton, etc., *July 24*, 1048.
Enlistment and Recruiting
Number joined in Great Britain and Ireland in 1899 and 1900, etc., *July 26*, 1307.
Under-age Recruits, Discharge of—Case of Private Walsh, *July 19*, 458.
Estimates—Supplementary Estimates, Statement, *July 27*, 1526—Replies to Questions and Criticism, 1591, 1592, 1615.
Guns, Erosion of, by Cordite—Committee of Inquiry, *July 17*, 226.
Head-gear—Death of Private Ward at Yarmouth from Sunstroke, alleged, *July 26*, 1305.
Jersey Military Garrison—Annual Cost, *July 26*, 1305.
Line Battalions, Formation of New Battalions—Band and Mess Expenses, *July 17*, 225.
Medical Officers
Reserve Officers—Promotion Regulations, *July 20*, 647.
Retired Officers Recalled to Active Service, *July 27*, 1503.
Military Lands Act, 1892—Purchase of Land by County and Borough Councils, etc., *July 23*, 859.
Military Lands Bill, 2R., *July 23*, 890, 899, 905, 911, 918, 921.
Militia
Bounty, Pay, and Allowances, Increase in, *July 26*, 1303.
Furlough, Pay of Embodied Militiamen, *July 17*, 226.
Irish Regiments in England—Granting Furlough during Harvest time, *July 16*, 67.
Officers' Pay—Drawing Full and Retired Pay at the same time, *July 27*, 1507.
Sergeant Majors—Warrant Rank, *July 27*, 1508.
Picric Acid, Manufacture of, in England—Sufficient Supply for the Army and Navy, *July 17*, 226.
Promotion Board — Constitution and Functions, etc., *July 26*, 1307, 1308; *July 27*, 1506.

Wyndham, Mr. G.—*cont.*
Reserve Forces Bill, 2R., *July 18*, 385, 387; *Com.*, *July 23*, 966; *Con.*, *July 25*, 1163.
Rifle Clubs, Formation of—Government Allowances, *July 20*, 648.
Royal Reserve Battalions
Bounty, Pay and Allowances, Increase in, *July 26*, 1303.
Number of Re-enlisted Men in Great Britain and Ireland, *July 26*, 1307.
Sentry Duty in the Metropolis—Number of Men detailed for Guard and Sentry-go, etc., *July 19*, 462.
South African War
Boer Women sent over to Enemy's Lines, *July 20*, 647; *July 23*, 858; *July 24*, 1044; *July 26*, 1303.
Boots for the Troops—Inadequate Supply, *July 19*, 459.
British Forces, Reinforcements—Statistics, *July 20*, 646.
Casualties
British Casualties in June, *July 27*, 1501.
Delay in publishing—Case of Sergeant French and Private Martin, *July 16*, 66.
Censorship of Letters and Telegrams—Complaints, *July 27*, 1619.
Suppression of Message from Meeting held at Westminster Palace Hotel, *July 27*, 1594, 1595, 1596.
Chaplains—Insufficient Supply, *July 19*, 462.
Civil Surgeons
Number Employed in South Africa, etc., *July 16*, 65.
Supposed Pledge of Secrecy, *July 20*, 643; *July 26*, 1302; *July 27*, 1503.
Discharged Soldiers, Treatment of—Case of Private Weir, *July 16*, 66.
Enteric Fever
Inoculation against—Results among Officers and Men, etc., *July 24*, 1045.
Ladysmith, *July 16*, 65.
Gifts for the Troops—Non-delivery of, to the Imperial Yeomanry, *July 26*, 1302.
Gratuities to Volunteer Officers, *July 27*, 1505.
Honnen Spruit Disaster—Despatch of ex-prisoners to guard Spruit, etc., *July 26*, 1303.
Hospitals
Boers in British Hospitals—Number, Treatment, etc., *July 19*, 456.
Number of Men in Hospital from Causes other than Wounds, *July 23*, 858.

Wyndham, Mr. G.—*cont.*
South African War—*cont.*
Invalided Officers and Men—Number Invalided Home, Number of Deaths, etc., *July 19*, 460.
Lindley Disaster—Inquiry, *July 27*, 1501.
Martial Law in Cape Colony—Detention of Persons in Civil and Military Prisons, *July 17*, 221.
Medical Comforts for the Boers—Treatment of British Prisoners, *July 27*, 1502.
Nurses, Number of Deaths—More Nurses for South Africa, etc., *July 24*, 1045.
Pretoria Magazine, Attempt to blow up, *July 17*, 224; *July 25*, 1044.
Prisoners
Boer Prisoners, Despatch of, to Ceylon—Number etc., *July 23*, 857.
British Prisoners at Pretoria—Treatment, *July 20*, 646.
Royal Irish Rifles—Command, *July 27*, 1503.
Stores Transferred from Navy to Land Service—Return, *July 24*, 1047.
Surrender of British Troops, etc.—Inquiry, *July 27*, 1504.
Transport Service—"Avondale Castle," Transport to South Africa, Canteen Prices, etc., *July 19*, 458.
Tugela Engagement—Publication of Col. Long's Explanation, *July 19*, 459.
Yeomanry Encampment near Beira, *July 27*, 1505.
Volunteers
Employment on Foreign Service, *July 27*, 1505.
Engineer Corps for South-East Lancashire, Formation of, *July 20*, 649; *July 26*, 1306.
Garrison Duty—Offers of Services, etc., *July 24*, 1046.
Inniskilling Fusiliers at Cowshott Manor Camp—Call to Volunteer for Service in South Africa, *July 19*, 460; *July 23*, 858.
Kent Artillery—Easter Camp Allowances, *July 20*, 648.
Lancashire
Engineer Corps for South-East Lancashire, Formation of, *July 20*, 649; *July 26*, 1306.
Travelling Expenses, Supplementary Grant, etc., *July 23*, 860.
Leicesters, 1st Battalion—Insufficient Supply of Rifles, *July 24*, 1048.

Wyndham, Mr. G.—*cont.*
Volunteers—*cont.*
South Denes Camp—Col. Brownrigg prohibiting Visits and Collections by Sisters of Nazareth, *July 19*, 459; *July 20*, 649; *July 24*, 1047.
Volunteers Bill, 2R., *July 18*, 344, 361, 367, 368, 369, 370, 381, 383, 384, 385; *Com.*, *July 23*, 934, 937, 940, 941, 953, 954, 955, 956, 958, 960, 961, 962, 965.

Yang-tsze River
see China.

Yarmouth
South Denes Camp, *see* that title.
Ward, Private W., Death of, from Sunstroke, alleged
Q. Mr. Soames; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 26*, 1305.

Yeomanry
Australia—Raising an Imperial Yeomanry in Australia, proposed
O. Lord Brassey, *July 19*, 437.
South African War—Imperial Yeomanry Encampment near Beira
Q. Sir J. Fergusson; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 27*, 1504.
Imperial Yeomanry Invalided Home—Treatment of, by the War Office
O. Mr. Seely, *July 27*, 1599.
Lindley Disaster, *see* South African War.
Parcels, Non-delivery of
Q. Mr. H. S. Foster; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *July 26*, 1302.

Yerburgh, Mr. R. A. [Chester]
Artillery—Reserves of Artillery and Ammunition on the outbreak of the South African War, *July 24*, 1045.

Yerburgh, Mr. R. A.—*cont.*
China—Anti-Foreign Rising, etc.
Warren, Mr., Consul-General at Shanghai—Appointment as Chargé d'Affaires proposed, *July 20*, 641.
Yang-tsze Provinces
Holding Troops in readiness at Hong Kong, *July 20*, 642.
Viceroys maintaining Order—Support of Her Majesty's Government, *July 19*, 455; *July 23*, 851.

York Postal Staff
Assistant Inspector of Postmen keeping Shop with Beer Off-licence
Q. Mr. Steadman; *A.* Mr. Hanbury, *July 20*, 655.

Yorkshire, West Riding
Polling District—County Council Order Presented, *July 16*, 8, 56.

Young, Mr. S. [Cavan, E.]
Cootehill Postmastership — Condition attached to Previous Appointment, *July 19*, 472.
Gas Order Confirmation (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *July 17*, 213.
Land Commission
Belfast—Increases of Rent, etc., *July 16*, 82.
Case of Lindsay *v.* Corry, *July 17*, 237.

Youthful Offenders Bill
Bill Withdrawn, *July 16*, 187.

Yoxall, Mr. J. H. [Nottingham, W.]
Teachers' Superannuation Act, Extending to Channel Islands and Isle of Man—Legislation, *July 16*, 71.